

1969

An evaluation of selection of disadvantaged youths for four Iowa youth-work programs

John George Martens
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>



Part of the [Inequality and Stratification Commons](#), and the [Labor Economics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Martens, John George, "An evaluation of selection of disadvantaged youths for four Iowa youth-work programs" (1969). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 17115.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/17115>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

143
AN EVALUATION OF SELECTION OF DISADVANTAGED
YOUTHS FOR FOUR IOWA YOUTH-WORK PROGRAMS

by

John George Martens

A Thesis Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE

Major Subject: Economics

Signatures have been redacted for privacy

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1969

HD6274.18
M316e
c.2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	1
Description of the Problem	1
Description of the Analysis	3
CHAPTER II. DESCRIPTION OF THE FOUR I-TRY SUMMER PROGRAMS	4
Des Moines' Operation Youth Opportunity	4
Davenport Community Pride Incorporated	13
Waterloo Metropolitan Improvement Services Incorporated	15
Cedar Rapids' Youth Employment Services	20
CHAPTER III. SELECTION OF ENROLLEES FOR THE I-TRY PROGRAMS	25
Tools for the Evaluation of the Selection Processes	27
Evaluation of the Selection Processes in the Four I-TRY Programs	29
A Summary of the Characteristics of all I-TRY Participants	65
An Evaluation of the Reliability of Parental and Enrollee Reports of Income for Use in Screening Applicants	67
Some Suggestions for the Selection of Disadvantaged Youths for Employment Programs	73
CHAPTER IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	76
LITERATURE CITED	79
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	84
APPENDIX A	85
APPENDIX B	104
APPENDIX C	144

T21404

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2.1.	Operation Youth Opportunity jobs for youth, summer of 1968	6
2.2.	Areas of emphasis in the counseling-training component of Operation Youth Opportunity	11
2.3.	Operation Youth Opportunity field trips	12
2.4.	Community Pride Incorporated public service jobs	14
2.5.	Metropolitan Improvement Services employment distribution, Waterloo, Iowa	19
2.6.	Youth Employment Services work stations	22
2.7.	Partial list of educational activities	24
3.1.	Operation Youth Opportunity family income-family size guidelines	30
3.2.	Comparison of family income reports with the family income-family size guidelines for Des Moines Operation Youth Opportunity	32
3.3.	Family income as reported by enrollees, parents, and the State Department of Revenue for Des Moines' Operation Youth Opportunity	35
3.4.	Characteristics of enrollees exceeding family income guidelines for Des Moines	37
3.5.	Youth Employment Services' family income-family size guidelines	40
3.6.	Comparison of reported income with the family income- family size guidelines for Cedar Rapids' Youth Employment Services	41
3.7.	Family income as reported by enrollees and the State Department of Revenue for Cedar Rapids' Youth Employment Services	43
3.8.	Characteristics of enrollees exceeding family income guidelines for Cedar Rapids' Youth Employment Services	45
3.9.	Family income as reported by enrollees and the State Department of Revenue for Waterloo's MIS program	48

Table		Page
3.10.	Family income as reported by the youths not selected and the State Department of Revenue figures for these youths not selected for Waterloo's MIS program	51
3.11.	Comparison of family income reports with the family income-family size guidelines for Waterloo MIS enrollees	53
3.12.	Characteristics of enrollees exceeding a family income guideline for Waterloo MIS enrollees	54
3.13.	Family income as reported by enrollees and the State Department of Revenue for Davenport Play Corps enrollees	56
3.14.	Comparison of family income reports with the family income-family size guidelines for Davenport Play Corps enrollees	59
3.15.	Characteristics of enrollees exceeding family income guidelines for the Play Corps enrollees paid by CPI	60
3.16.	Summary of enrollees over the income guidelines by over \$300, Department of Revenue figures	61
3.17.	Summary of race of all enrollees and those over the income guidelines	62
3.18.	Summary of enrollees dropping out of school	62
3.19.	Summary of enrollees from households of over six members	63
3.20.	Summary of enrollees missing at least one parent	63
3.21.	Summary of social class of those enrollees over the income guidelines	64
3.22.	Comparison of reported family incomes for Des Moines' Operation Youth Opportunity	68
3.23.	Enrollees reported family income minus Department of Revenue reported income	70
B.1.	Age distribution of participants in Project I-TRY	105
B.2.	Sex of I-TRY participants	107
B.3.	Race of I-TRY participants	109

Table	Page
B.4. Educational level of I-TRY participants	111
B.5. School status	115
B.6. Reasons for not returning to school	117
B.7. Number of people in I-TRY participants' household	119
B.8. Head of family of I-TRY participant	123
B.9. Education of family head of I-TRY participants	125
B.10. Status of parents	129
B.11. Problems with school or law as reported by I-TRY participants	133
B.12. Number in household with job	136
B.13. Number looking for a job	138
B.14. Expected future education of I-TRY participants	140

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Description of the Problem

Education, training and work experience are for the youth of today the foundation for a productive life. Yet for many youth the future looks very bleak indeed; especially for youth from socially and economically disadvantaged families. Of approximately 26 million youth entering the labor force between 1960 and 1970, 7.5 million or 29.1 percent will have not completed high school (43, p. 7). During May 1968 the unemployed, out-of-school youth, ages 16-21, totaled 865,000 or 8.8 percent of this age 16-21 labor force. The unemployment rate among non-white males 16-21 years of age was 15.0 percent. Of the unemployed youth 16-19, forty percent had never held a job (57, No. 12, Table A.3).

The prospect for summer employment of youth, which gives valuable work experience and financial help with schooling, is even more bleak. During June and July of 1968, 1.8 million or 14.0 percent of the youth seeking work were unemployed. Although youth employment increased 450,000 from 1967, unemployment increased 100,000 due to expansion of the labor force. In addition to the unemployed, 1.0 million youths ages 16-21 desired full-time work but were only able to work part-time. The unemployment rate for non-white youth was 26.0 percent (58, No. 2, pp. 6-9; 58, No. 3, p. 5).

Governor Harold E. Hughes of Iowa in the summer of 1967 saw employment for disadvantaged youth as one possible way to lessen the many social problems that caused civil disorders and riots in many U.S. and Iowa cities during that summer. Governor Hughes visited Iowa's major cities and asked private businessmen to provide funds to employ disadvantaged youth. In five

cities \$300,000 was raised to provide employment for 1,000 disadvantaged youth during August 1967.

Governor Hughes hoped to continue and expand youth employment in the summer of 1968 with the partial use of federal funds. On April 1, 1968 a contract was completed between the Iowa Manpower Development Council and the United States Department of Labor, Manpower Administration providing assistance through matching grants for the continuance and expansion of locally financed youth-work programs. The objective of the allocation from the Labor Department to cities in Iowa was to assess the feasibility and relative effectiveness of government-industry partnerships for financing locally developed youth-work programs.

The programs, according to guidelines, should be aimed at disadvantaged youth ages 14-21. The programs should cover a 12 month period and include ancillary and supportive services (e.g. tutoring, counseling, cultural exposure, etc.). The Department of Labor funds would be used to provide the ancillary and supportive services. The funds raised locally would be matched on a one federal to four local basis.

Governor Hughes again toured the major Iowa cities to promote youth employment for the summer of 1968 and to promote many other human resource programs. A complete description of efforts of Governor Hughes in human resource development may be found in the publication by James Socknat (49). In 1968, 1,100 youths were provided with employment in the four cities receiving matching grants for ancillary and supportive services.

The Iowa Manpower Development Council contracted with the Industrial Relations Center of Iowa State University to conduct an evaluation of the employment for youth programs receiving matching Project I-TRY (Iowa Training

and Retraining of Youth) funds for ancillary and supportive services. This evaluation of the selection of enrollees for these programs is a portion of the study conducted by the Industrial Relations Center for the Iowa Manpower Development Council.

All youths who want a summer job should be given an opportunity to work, but when summer jobs are as limited as they were in the cities with I-TRY programs, a decision has to be made concerning which youth could gain the most from an employment experience. This thesis explains the goals of each city for selection of enrollees, and evaluates their effectiveness in reaching these goals.

Description of the Analysis

This thesis is restricted to an evaluation of selection of disadvantaged youths for youth-work programs and is a part of a total evaluation of the programs including training of enrollees. An analysis will be made of the selection process by use of three sources of income data and use of other criterions that may indicate a youth is disadvantaged (e.g. arrests, families on welfare, family size, etc.). The personal and family characteristics of the enrollees indicate their degree of need.

To evaluate the training portion of the program, changes had to be detected in the enrollees that might indicate the program had a positive effect. The analysis of training is presented in a later publication of the Project I-TRY evaluation.

CHAPTER II. DESCRIPTION OF THE FOUR I-TRY SUMMER PROGRAMS

Following is a description of the four summer youth employment programs which utilized Project I-TRY (Iowa Training and Retraining of Youth) funds from the Iowa Manpower Development Council. The I-TRY funds were used in the educational-counseling portions of the four programs. All four cities also developed year-around programs which are not discussed here but will be covered in a later publication of the Industrial Relations Center's Project I-TRY Evaluation.

Des Moines' Operation Youth Opportunity

Community Improvement Incorporated (CII) originated as a positive response to the urban tensions and racial disturbances of the summer of 1967. Two disturbances occurred in Des Moines during the summer but neither was considered serious by the U.S. President's Committee on Civil Disorders. Private business at the encouragement of Governor Harold E. Hughes formed CII to take an active part in solving the urban problems of Des Moines. Their efforts in August 1967 were devoted to providing jobs for disadvantaged youth.

CII planned a more extensive youth-work program for the summer of 1968, contracting with the Des Moines YMCA to administer the summer project under the YMCA Youth Program Department. The Des Moines Public Schools supervised the educational program. The Iowa State Employment Service handled applications, interviews, screening and placement through their Youth Employment Service.

The objective of the CII Operation Youth Opportunity Program was to

give youth from low and marginal income families a meaningful work experience. Through work experience, counseling and training in the CII program, youth were encouraged to complete school, acquire good work habits, acquire useful skills and pursue useful occupations.

Approximately 607 youth 14-18 years of age were placed in jobs with public agencies and private non-profit education and welfare institutions. Table 2.1 gives a listing of employers and jobs developed.

The youth worked seven hours, four days a week for a total of 28 hours at \$1.25/hour. They were also paid for an additional four hours for attending an educational program on a fifth day giving them a total earning capacity of \$40 per week.

For the educational and counseling portion of the CII program an educational supervisor was hired to supervise the counseling staff and to develop the counseling programs; a counseling coordinator was hired to provide leadership for the training assistants and field trip coordinators; and nine training assistants were hired to give direction and counseling to youth, to help develop large meetings and to visit youth in their homes as needed. Charles Palmer of the Des Moines Child Guidance Center was used as a consultant to this portion of the program.

Fifty youth were assigned each morning and afternoon to the educational program at the YMCA which was the major portion of the educational-counseling component of Operation Youth Opportunity. Audio-visual vocational material was presented plus group discussions on work attitudes, opportunities for work, education and training, recreation, health, community and youth problems. Field trips were organized but eventually dropped due to a lack of interest. Tables 2.2 and 2.3 describe the field trips and

Table 2.1. Operation Youth Opportunity jobs for youth, summer of 1968^a

	Sub divisions & job descriptions	Depart- ments	Totals
I. CITY OF DES MOINES			229
Finance Department		4	
Office Assistants	4		
Health Department		18	
Office Assts	2		
Animal Control	3		
Nurses Assts	6		
Rodent & Insect Control	7		
Human Rights Commission		1	
Office Assts	1		
Municipal Airport		12	
Inside Custodial	6		
Grounds & Maintenance	6		
Municipal Library		12	
Book Inventory	8		
Building & Grounds	4		
Parks Department		58	
Maintenance Work:			
Waveland Golf Course	6		
A. H. Blank Park-Zoo	20		
Nursery	6		
Greenhouse	2		
Riverfront	4		
Park Shop	2		
Pioneer Park	4		
Glendale Cemetery	8		
Woodland Cemetery	6		
Police Department		19	
Office Assts	3		
Community Relations Pr	3		
Parking Lot Attendant	1		
Traffic Bureau & Police	5		
Garage			
Inside Custodial	4		
River Patrol Asst	1		
Patrol Bureau	2		
Municipal Court		2	
Clerical	2		
Public Works Department		81	
Forestry	38		

^aSource: (9).

Table 2.1. (Continued)

	Sub divisions & job descriptions	Depart- ments	Totals
Street Maintenance	10		
Bridge Division	12		
Sewage Treatment Plant	5		
Land Fill Clean Up	7		
City Garage	8		
River Hills	1		
Recreation Department		8	
Assts. at Playgrounds	8		
Traffic & Transportation		11	
Parking Meter Shop	3		
Traffic Sign Shop	8		
City Assessor's Office		3	
Clerical	3		
II. <u>DES MOINES WATER WORKS</u>			19
Grounds Labor		5	
Garage		4	
Construction		4	
Plant Labor		4	
Service Labor		2	
III. <u>CITY OF WEST DES MOINES</u>			4
Parks Department		4	
IV. <u>POLK COUNTY</u>			28
Broadlawns Hospital		6	
Outside Maintenance	2		
Inside Custodial	1		
Medical Records File Rm.	1		
Admitting Room	1		
Laundry	1		
Court House		15	
Zoning Office	2		
Recorder's Office	2		
Friend of Court	1		
Auditor's Office	2		
Board of Supervisors	2		
Clerk of Court	2		
Sheriff's Office	2		
Treasurer's Office	2		

Table 2.1. (Continued)

	Sub divisions & job descriptions	Depart- ments	Totals
County Home		3	
Inside Custodial	1		
Outside Custodial	2		
Polk County Welfare		4	
Commodities	2		
Clerical	2		
V. <u>STATE OF IOWA</u>			72
Department of Public Safety		9	
Filing & Limited Typing	9		
Bldgs. & Grounds		25	
Inside Custodial	10		
Outside Maintenance	15		
Department of Revenue		10	
Stock Clerks	5		
File Clerks	5		
Insurance Department		1	
File Clerk	1		
Liquor Control Commission		2	
File Clerks & Typing	2		
State OEO Office		2	
File Clerks	2		
Department of Social Services		3	
Mail Clerk	1		
Destroy Case Records	2		
Employment Security Commission		17	
(File Clerks, Typists, & Messengers)			
Clearance Section	5		
Test Section	2		
Training Department	2		
Retirement Division	2		
Legal Division	2		
Information Services	2		
Research & Statistics	2		
Department of Public Instruction		3	
File Clerks	3		
VI. <u>UNITED COMMUNITY SERVICES AGENCIES</u>			49
Boy Scouts		1	
General Office	1		
Convalescent Home		5	

Table 2.1. (Continued)

	Sub divisions & job descriptions	Depart- ments	Totals
Maintenance	5		
Hawley Bldg. Office Assts.....		6	
UCS Office	3		
Mayor's Task Force	1		
Information & Referral	2		
Center			
Iowa Children's & Family Ser.....		1	
Maintenance	1		
Catholic Charities		1	
Office Asst.....	1		
Health Center		2	
File Clerk	1		
Office Asst	1		
YWCA		5	
Cafeteria Asst.....	1		
Custodial Assts.....	4		
Legal Aid		2	
Clerical	1		
Maintenance	1		
Julia B. Mayer		16	
Program Aides	8		
Locker Room Assts	3		
Clerical Aides	2		
Maintenance Aides	3		
Roadside Settlement		9	
Nursery Assts.....	2		
Program Aides	3		
Clerical Aides	2		
Maintenance Aides	2		
Willkie House		1	
Clerical Asst.....	1		
VII. <u>YMCA</u>			6
Clerical Asst.....		1	
Food Service, C.I.I.....		5	
VIII. <u>OAKRIDGE OPPORTUNITY CENTER</u>			5
Neighborhood Survey	5		

Table 2.1. (Continued)

	Sub divisions & job descriptions	Depart- ments	Totals
IX. <u>DES MOINES PUBLIC SCHOOLS</u>			99
Elementary		46	
Clerical Assts.....	24		
Maintenance	22		
Jr. High Schools		24	
Clerical Assts.....	24		
High Schools		22	
Clerical Assts.....	5		
Maintenance	17		
School Board Office		7	
(Clerical Assts.)			
KDPS	2		
Music Office	1		
Adult Education	1		
Instructional Media	3		
X. <u>GREATER OPPORTUNITIES, INC. - NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS</u>			16
NYC Placements on C.I.I. Payroll			
(Placed by NYC, but were over NYC income guidelines - would have			
been taken off their jobs, so in order to keep them working they			
were moved to C.I.I. payroll)			
XI. <u>BANKERS LIFE COMPANY</u>			6
Maintenance Assts.....		6	
XII. <u>IOWA WELFARE ASSOCIATION</u>			1
Clerical		1	
TOTAL (Include Field Aides - 32)			<u>566</u>

Possible variance in job totals due to leaving jobs, reassignments,
etc.

Table 2.2. Areas of emphasis in the counseling-training component of Operation Youth Opportunity^a

Topics as developed by the O.Y.O. training staff

Development of C.I.I.
 Responsibility to employers
 Job attitudes
 Fields of employment
 Limitations of short term work
 The uses of money
 The use of the YMCA as a C.I.I. facility
 The dangers, prevention, and care of venereal disease
 Sexual morality-its personal application
 The possible problems resulting from promiscuous sex
 Teen-age social behavior
 Religion
 Personal pride
 Proper dress
 The dynamics of group behavior
 The meaning of freedom for Americans
 Education beyond high school
 Personal hygiene
 The meaning of Black Power - positive or negative
 The problems, implications and cures of prejudice
 The role of government
 Negro culture in the American setting
 Negro place in history - African and American
 The dropout problem - the causes and the results
 Discipline - a personal responsibility
 The vocabulary of a bigot
 Poverty - the causes and the cures

^aSource: (9).

educational activities offered to O.Y.O. enrollees.

The personnel in the work experience component of Operation Youth Opportunity consisted of a general coordinator who supervised all personnel in this component, a work-experience coordinator, five field supervisors who visited job stations and worked with youth in adjusting to employment, and 32 field aides who gave direction and set good examples for youth

Table 2.3. Operation Youth Opportunity field trips^a

A list of O.Y.O. field trips and the number of participants			
		A.M.	P.M.
June	24 Register and Tribune	38	20
	25 United Federal	35	35
	26 Iowa-Des Moines	35	35
	27 Central National	45	35
	28 Bankers Trust	45	35
July	1 Armstrong/Firestone	20	15
	2 Salisbury/John Deere	25	40
	3 Armstrong	30	25
	4 Holiday	--	--
	5 Business Holiday	--	--
July	8 Salisbury House	30	30
	9 Historical Building	15	2
	10 Salisbury/Youngers	30	7
	11 Roadside Settlement	--	--
	12 Look Magazine	35	--
July	15 Meredith	10	10
	16 Register and Tribune	3	1
	17 Meredith	10	10
	18 KRNT	--	11
	19 Pittsburgh-Des Moines Steel	20	--
July	22 Iowa Power	5	5
	23 Bell Telephone	3	--
	24 (No trip)	--	--

^aSource: (9).

working in crews. On-the-job supervisors were supplied by the various employers utilizing CII enrollees.

CII raised over \$170,000 to support youth employment projects in Des Moines during 1968 (9).

Davenport Community Pride Incorporated

Community Pride Incorporated (CPI) was organized in August 1967 at the urging of Governor Harold E. Hughes of Iowa as a local effort to effectively meet the problems of poverty and racial discrimination in the Davenport area. CPI is a non-profit corporation comprised of the business and industrial sector of Scott County. A small youth employment program was organized in 1967 and plans for a larger 1968 summer program evolved in March of 1968.

CPI employed approximately 100 youth between 14-16 years of age in jobs developed primarily in the public sector. Wages were paid by CPI for these employees. The enrollees worked 10 weeks, 5 days a week, 6 hours a day at a wage of \$1.25/hour. Priority in placement was given to needy youth and youth from minority groups.

CPI placed and encouraged the placement of youth 16-21 years of age in jobs with the business and industrial sector on a full-time basis. Priority again was given to needy youths and youths from minority groups.

The non-profit employment portion of the CPI program was divided into two parts. The first part was work in city and county civic improvements, including parks, cemeteries and other properties, and work assignments for the benefit of non-profit organizations within the community. Table 2.4. lists the various job assignments.

The second part of the non-profit employment was the Play Corps program which was run through the Friendly House, a community settlement house. Thirty youths paid by CPI and thirty youths paid by Neighborhood Youth Corps funds were hired as Play Corps leaders. This program was designed not only to help the disadvantaged youth hired as Play Corps leaders but to provide

Table 2.4. Community Pride Incorporated public service jobs^a

	Number of boys	Number of girls
St. Vincent's Home	-	2
Office help for Community Pride	-	4
Office help for U.C.S.	-	2
Office help for Chamber of Commerce	-	1
Campfire Girl office	-	1
Kahl Home for the Aged	1	1
Red Cross	2	1
Children and Family Services	1	-
Friendly House	3	2
Lend-a-hand	1	-
Eagle Signal	1	-
Oakdale, Fairmount, & Pine Hill Cemetaries	36	-
Municipal Stadium	5	-
Camp Mansur	5	-
Sewage Treatment Plant	2	-
General Maintenance	1	-
Traffic Engineering	1	-
City Hall	3	-
Davenport Airport	3	-
Parking meters	1	-
Not specified	2	-

^aSource: Community Pride Inc., Davenport, Iowa. Statistical data. Private Communication. 1968.

supervised recreational activities for children in the poverty areas of Davenport.

Dale Terry, a school teacher, was hired as coordinator of the program

and worked with the seven college students and one housewife hired as counselors and supervisors for the Play Corps leaders. Each counselor provided counseling and supervision to eight Play Corps leaders. The Play Corps leaders were organized into teams of two; one boy-one girl, one black-one white. These teams were responsible for organized recreation in their assigned blocks.

One hundred and twenty blocks were covered each day by the Play Corps leaders. Each team spent 1 1/2 hours at each of four blocks during a day conducting organized games and activities. Approximately 650 children participated each day. Field trips were organized for the children by the Play Corps leaders to bakeries, Mother Goose Land, an airport, farms, KSTT, police and fire stations, the Annie Wittenmeyer Home, the Jewish Temple, and to the museum and art gallery.

Waterloo Metropolitan Improvement Services Incorporated

Waterloo's Metropolitan Improvement Services Incorporated (MIS) was organized in the summer of 1967 as a positive response to racial disturbances and civil disorders occurring in Waterloo and many other cities in the United States that summer. The disorder in Waterloo was one of thirty-three classified by the U.S. Riot Commission Report as serious (33, p. 158).

"The serious riot was characterized generally by: (1) isolated looting, some fires, and some rock throwing; (2) violence lasting between one and two days; (3) only one sizeable crowd or many small groups; (4) and use of state police, though generally not National Guard or federal forces." (33, p. 113)

The following statistical information gives some insight into special social and economic problems in Waterloo. Waterloo has had a 21.5 percent increase in non-white population between 1960 and 1966 compared with an

overall population increase of 3.2 percent. The non-white portion of Waterloo's 74,023 residents is 8.1 percent, mostly concentrated in one sector of the city. Eleven percent of Waterloo's families had incomes below \$3,000 and 28 percent had incomes below \$5,000 according to the 1960 census. Twenty-three percent of Waterloo's non-white families had incomes below \$3,000 and 45 percent had incomes below \$5,000. (51, Tables 13, 21, 22; 52, Tables 33, 76, 78; 56, Table 1)

A concerned Governor Harold E. Hughes visited Waterloo following the riot to ask businessmen to raise funds for a non-profit corporation to provide employment for youth throughout the rest of the summer. Employment for youth was seen as one measure which could be quickly implemented and non-controversial to attack some of the underlying social and economic problems that cause people to riot. It was hoped that youth could be given valuable work experience, training, and that minority groups (racial and economic) would see the employment program as a start to constructive solutions to the social and economic problems of the community.

In a remarkable period of time, only ten days, Metropolitan Improvement Services, Inc. was organized; twenty businessmen had contributed \$56,200 to the corporate coffers; and many youths were already on the job. This crash employment program employed disadvantaged youth in Waterloo for a total of 8,161.5 hours in the summer of 1967.¹ The jobs were developed mainly in the public sector of the city.

MIS, Inc. recognized a problem encountered by many large cities, that being the large and increasing number of students who fail to complete their

¹Metropolitan Improvement Services, Inc., Waterloo, Iowa. Statistical data. Personal Communication. 1968.

schooling. Waterloo's dropout rate at East High School is about twice that of Iowa as a whole. MIS, Inc. cooperated with the schools in a work-study program to eliminate the financial and employment incentives to dropout of school for 30 potential dropouts at East High School during the school year 1967-1968. Part-time jobs were provided for these youth along with a special vocational course to supplement their other studies.

While the winter employment program was running in Waterloo, plans were being made for a more extensive MIS, Inc. employment program for the following summer by the schools and other community agencies along with MIS officials. A need was felt to provide jobs for youth 14-15 years of age who were too young for the Neighborhood Youth Corps and too young to compete with the more mature and experienced youth for scarce summer jobs. The 1967 contributors to MIS, Inc. were asked to give one half of their contribution of a year before to employ 140 youths ages 14 and 15 for the summer of 1968, four hours a day, five days a week. Twenty-nine thousand four-hundred seventy-three dollars was carried over from the employment program of a year before.¹

According to program planners the main objectives of the 1968 summer program would be to:

1. develop in each youth a feeling of self-worth.
2. develop a feeling of individual competency as a result of success in the world of work.
3. develop the decision-making abilities of youth in such a way as to enhance their employability.
4. develop in youth a feeling of the availability of a position in our economic world for each individual who endeavors to succeed.
5. develop the feeling of independence, responsibility and dignity that earned wages can create.

¹Ibid.

6. develop an understanding of the problems faced by minority groups in vocational areas.
7. develop an understanding of job opportunities in Waterloo, our state and our nation.¹

In order to achieve these objectives there was a slight change in direction for the 1968 program. Funds were applied for from the Iowa Manpower Development Council to pay for educational and counseling services. It was felt by program administrators that the most successful vocational education projects have adequate supervision, related instruction, and vocational and personal problem counseling. Ten college students from the University of Northern Iowa were hired to be on-the-job supervisors. They provided job supervision and instruction plus personal counseling for groups of seven workers. Group counseling and related instruction sessions of two hours were planned twice each week on the half days workers were not assigned to work stations. A counselor from East High School was hired to counsel youth on a personal basis and to conduct the special educational and group counseling sessions. Tours were made through Waterloo businesses; films were shown of job opportunities, job interviewing, the importance of remaining in school, etc.; and group counseling and lectures were given. The youth were required to participate in this portion of the program.

The jobs provided in the summer of 1968 were mainly in the public and non-profit type of organization. MIS, Inc. officials indicated a concern that all jobs be meaningful and not just make-work. It was hoped that the youth would have a feeling of accomplishment from completing a meaningful task. The youth were paid \$1.00 per hour for their labor.

¹Metropolitan Improvement Services, Inc., Waterloo, Iowa, Contract for I-TRY Funding.

Table 2.5 is a list of employers in the non-profit sector of Waterloo and the hours worked at each station.

Table 2.5. Metropolitan Improvement Services^a employment distribution, Waterloo, Iowa

Work station	1967 Total hours	1968 Total hours	1968 Dollars
Airport Commission	128.0	496.0	\$ 496.00
Arborist	--	1328.1	1,328.10
Columbus High School	136.0	972.0	972.00
Girl Scouts	100.0	--	--
Goodwill Industries	87.0		
Humane Society	--	848.0	848.00
Park Commission	2759.5	1420.5	1,420.50
Parking Ramp	--	3839.5	3,839.50
Police Department	50.0	--	--
Recreation Commission	991.0	2371.5	2,371.50
Riverfront Commission	2685.5	1754.0	1,754.00
Roving Crews (Cemetaries)	--	1810.5	1,810.50
Schoitz Hospital	--	338.0	338.00
Sewer Department	240.0	--	--
St. Francis Hospital	--	131.0	131.00
Street Department	--	246.0	246.00
University of Northern Iowa	686.0	3049.3	3,964.35
Waterloo City Schools	220.0	3840.8	3,840.80
Water Works	--	1778.3	1,778.30
YMCA	78.5	--	--
YWCA		144.2	144.20
Total	8161.50	24,367.7	25,282.75

^aSource: Metropolitan Improvement Services, Inc., Waterloo, Iowa. Employment data. Personal Communication. October 1968.

Cedar Rapids' Youth Employment Services

Following an appeal by Governor Harold E. Hughes to create jobs for youth in the summer of 1967, Cedar Rapids organized a youth-work program for disadvantaged youth financed by United Community Services and private contributions. A number of public works jobs were created and filled during August 1967. A committee of citizens including State Senator John Ely, representatives from each of the community action agency's target areas, the mayor of Cedar Rapids, chamber of commerce representatives, a county board of supervisors representative, and resource personnel from the Iowa State Employment Service, the Department of Social Welfare, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and the public school system met during Fall 1967 and Spring 1968 to plan a more extensive youth-employment program for 1968-1969. This committee plus the Cedar Rapids Chamber of Commerce through their fund-raising activities were responsible for the beginning of the Youth Employment Services Program (YES).

This committee felt that meaningful work and job experience were not open to disadvantaged youth in the Cedar Rapids area. By providing for and encouraging the employment of disadvantaged youth, Cedar Rapids hoped to achieve the objectives of the program which were to:

1. meaningfully employ low-income youth
2. develop job skills
3. teach good work habits
4. inform and educate youth of possible job opportunities
5. provide financial and consumer education
6. provide and use recreational and educational opportunities
7. increase the potential upward mobility of these youth
8. provide counseling to help them with personal problems
9. help reduce the school dropout rate in this group.¹

¹Youth Employment Services' Contract for Project I-TRY funds.

The committee decided to run the YES program through the structure of the local community action agency, Hawkeye Area Community Action Program (HACAP). HACAP was chosen because of their contact with the youth the program was designed to serve. Leo Owens was hired as director of YES. His duties were administration, planning, staff selection, screening enrollees, and providing the year-round enrollees, counseling and guidance. A counselor was hired to work with summer enrollees' problems. Job supervisors were hired to direct work crews. An education-recreation coordinator was hired to promote these activities. Recreation-education outreach workers were hired among the teens to involve other youths in the available recreational activities. An employment coordinator was hired to inspect and approve job sites and to encourage direct employment of the disadvantaged in the private sector. Over 200 disadvantaged youths were hired to work in the YES program. Forty-eight thousand four hundred fifty-six dollars and seventy-one cents in cash plus \$15,956.16 in in-kind contributions and \$13,867 in I-TRY funds went into the 1968-1969 Cedar Rapids summer and winter programs.¹

The YES program employed youths 14-20 years of age from economically, socially, and culturally disadvantaged families in Linn-County, mostly from the target areas as defined by the Community Action Program. The youths were placed in jobs from one of four categories. (1) Private business and industry were encouraged to employ older youths ages 18-20 as full-time employees. The YES program recruited, referred, and provided follow-up guidance for these youths. (2) Governmental and other agencies were asked

¹Youth Employment Services officials, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Funding data. Personal communication. October 1968.

to provide job slots for youths ages 16-20. (3) Supervised work crews of 14 and 15 year olds did clean-up, paint-up, fix-up, and other jobs in low-income neighborhoods. They also worked on clean-up after the summer floods. (4) The largest portion of the summer program was an employment service for odd jobs that citizens of the community were willing to pay to have done. It was felt that this was the best type of job for inexperienced young workers. YES tried to provide one-half day of work for enrollees 14-16 years of age and full-time employment for older youths. The jobs listed in Table 2.6 were developed for YES enrollees.

Table 2.6. Youth Employment Services work stations^a

Jobs	Number of boys	Number of girls
Girls office work	-	27
Maintenance	22	-
Yard work, lawn care, clean-up	91	-
Aides at county home	6	10
Hospital work	4	6
Equipment maintenance	2	-
Messenger and clerical	6	-
Girls housework and babysitting	-	22
Painting - interior and exterior	6	8
Sales clerks	-	3
Library	-	3
Lumber yard	2	-
Park work	6	-

^aSource: Youth Employment Services, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Employment data. Personal communication. August 1968.

The workers earned \$1.00 an hour for their services. It was felt that this should be raised to \$1.25 next year and that more hours of work should be provided.

Because of the many recreational activities available in Cedar Rapids, YES did not set up their own recreation program. An attempt was made to make existing facilities more accessible to low income youth. The YMCA agreed to provide free memberships and supervised recreation programs in swimming, team sports and other activities. Camperships were provided by private agencies and churches. Local theaters reduced admission prices for teens in the program. Recreation-education outreach workers were hired to contact and involve the youth in all recreation programs. These workers were hired among teens slightly older than those in the YES program.

The third facet of the YES program was the education program. Teaching job skills and job habits was a primary goal for adults supervising and working with the youth. Tours of businesses and industry trips to Backbone State Park, lectures, seminars and workshops were provided. Table 2.7 lists YES educational activities.

The fourth aspect of the YES program was the provision of counseling services for the enrollees. Job supervisors provided day to day counseling on the job and made referrals to the professional counselor on the YES staff. The professional counselor or "dutch uncle", as he was referred to in the program, was hired to provide professional guidance for program enrollees. Since most of the enrollees were 14-15 years old and working on their first job, a large part of the counseling concerned the responsibilities of employment: punctuality, pride in work, cooperativeness, good attendance, and procedures for registering of complaints. Enrollees were

encouraged to stay in school and were given vocational and educational guidance. Many needed counseling in how to get along with their peers. The "dutch uncle" was used to arrive at fair solutions to legitimate grievances.

Table 2.7. Partial list of educational activities^a

Activity	Attendance
Job application-job interviewer seminar	12
"How to file income tax returns"	53
Job opportunities lecture (Iowa State Employment Service)	50
"A prettier you: make-up"	6
"A prettier you: dress"	3
"A prettier you: hair care"	9
Employment interviews-role playing	14
Backbone State Park trip	26
Brunch and miniature golf	13
Corrine Shover lecture on beauty	13

^aSource: Youth Employment Services, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Education activities data. Personal communication. 1968.

CHAPTER III. SELECTION OF ENROLLEES
FOR THE I-TRY PROGRAMS

The cities which organized youth-work programs in the summer of 1968 had no trouble attracting many eager applicants looking for a way to earn some spending money and looking for activities to fill in the summer days. In all the cities with I-TRY programs, the demand for summer jobs far exceeded the supply. For example, it was estimated by Frank Owens, Youth Employment Specialist for the Iowa State Employment Service, that half of the youths in Des Moines wishing employment during the summer of 1968 did not find a job.¹ Even during periods when the unemployment rate is low for the nation as a whole, teenagers experience extreme difficulty in securing jobs. Some of these problems may result from the minimum hourly wage scales which force employers to pay inexperienced teenagers what the employers consider to be too high of a salary. Another cause is the increase in the size of the teenage labor force. For the nation as a whole nearly 13 million 16 to 21 year-olds were working or seeking employment in the summer of 1968 which was an increase of 550,000 over the summer of 1967. The number of jobs available for this group increased by only 450,000. Approximately 100,000 more youths in this age group were unemployed (58, No. 3, p. 5).

The problem of locating jobs is even more difficult for youths ages 14-15. In addition to being less experienced and mature when competing for scarce jobs with older teenagers, these youths are prevented from working

¹Owens, Frank. Des Moines, Iowa. Operation Youth Opportunity data. Private communication. March 1969.

in many types of jobs by Iowa's child labor laws. Even if they are not prevented from working at a particular job by law, many employers put a blanket rejection on applications by younger teenagers because they are not aware of the types of jobs acceptable by law for these youths. About the only jobs available to this group are grass mowing, leaf raking, and other odd jobs.

Because of the tremendous number of youths wanting summer employment, the cities with I-TRY programs had to set up standards and priorities for admission to their programs. In looking at criteria for the selection of enrollees for the Project I-TRY programs, it must be remembered that these programs were financed almost entirely by private funds and that the funding of these programs came about after the riots and civil disorders in the summer of 1967 brought an acute awareness among community leaders of the frustrations of poverty and lack of opportunity among many residents of Iowa's major cities. The contributors to the programs were probably aware that a large portion of the youth in their communities lacked an opportunity for summer employment, but were also aware of the opportunity to avoid possible trouble by economic and racial minority groups in their cities. All the I-TRY programs put a priority on the selection of youth from low-income families and youths who might be considered disadvantaged by other criteria (e.g. police problems, mental problems, family problems, minority group membership, etc.). The general feeling was that these youths had the most difficulty in locating and competing for scarce jobs, had the greatest need for supplementary income, and could receive the most benefit from a work experience. These programs were not welfare programs in that the youths worked for the income they received but the fact that

the programs were financed by private contributions gave them welfare aspects. The programs also concentrated on employment for 14 and 15 year old youth who have the most difficulty finding summer jobs.

Tools for the Evaluation of the Selection Processes

This study will evaluate the selection process in the four cities with I-TRY programs by their own criterion and by measures developed for this evaluation.

The Iowa State Department of Revenue cooperated with the Industrial Relations Center by providing confidential information concerning family incomes for a number of families with youths in the I-TRY programs. Because of difficulties in locating files and non-reporting of income by low-income families, only about twenty percent of the family incomes were located. The figures are adjusted gross family income from the 1967 Iowa State Income Tax forms. In examining this data about incomes, the reader must be reminded that the reported incomes are skewed to the upper income range because of the non-reporting of income by low-income families and families on welfare.

In Des Moines, family income information was made available from the confidential family income reports (Appendix C) completed by the parents of the applicants. This form asked for gross family income from all sources. Unfortunately, income information was not available for all enrollees selected for the Operation Youth Opportunity program. Applicants were required to indicate their family income before they received consideration for employment with Operation Youth Opportunity.

On Questionnaire I (Appendix A) of the I-TRY evaluation, a question was asked program enrollees about family income. The response rate was less than 50 percent on this question, partially because the youths were not aware of their family income and partially because of their refusal to respond.

A two-factor index of social position as developed by Hollingshead (32, pp. 235-237) was used to indicate in which social class the enrollees who exceeded the family income-family size guidelines belonged. This index was a modification of the original three-factor index developed by Hollingshead and Myers (23, pp. 387-397) and correlated .968 with the three-factor index (32, p. 16). The index was based upon educational attainment and occupational status of the family head. Families were separated into five classes from I-V (high to low). The characteristics of families in each class are discussed in Social Class and Mental Illness (23, pp. 66-136). As an example a doctor would fall into social class I while an unskilled factory worker with a ninth grade education would fall into class V, the lower class. An electrician with a high school diploma would fall into class IV and an accountant with a college degree would fall into class III.¹

An examination was made of certain personal and family characteristics that might indicate an enrollee was disadvantaged. Enrollees not returning to school are disadvantaged by lack of education in competing for jobs. Enrollees from exceptionally large families may be in a greater need of supplementary incomes. Many youths were disadvantaged because of a broken

¹For a more complete description of this index see Myers and Bean (32, pp. 235-238).

home or death of a parent. Many had had or were having problems involving the police. A large number of enrollees were non-white which may put them at a disadvantage in seeking an education and a job.

The term "disadvantaged youth" is hard to define and each program defined it differently. The term has been defined for purposes of this evaluation as a youth who has less chance than a majority of his peers for a successful life.

Evaluation of the Selection Processes in the Four I-TRY Programs

Des Moines' Operation Youth Opportunity

The Youth Employment Service of the Iowa State Employment Service in Des Moines handled screening, interviewing, and placement for the Community Improvement Inc. Operation Youth Opportunity Program (OYO). The Youth Employment Service also handled applications for the Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC), Youth Opportunity Campaign (YOC), and other summer employment for youth. Five interviewers determined which program the applicant would fit into, NYC and YOC having the strictest guidelines. If the youth didn't fit into these programs, a check was made to see if he would fit into the OYO program guidelines.

A confidential financial statement (Appendix C) was completed by a parent before the applicant was considered for employment. The statement indicated family size, family income, and whether or not the family was on a welfare program. Table 3.1 shows the OYO family income-family size guideline. OYO could admit youths above the guidelines if special personal or family circumstances warranted this.

Table 3.1. Operation Youth Opportunity
family income-family size
guidelines^a

Number of individuals in family	Family yearly gross income level
1	\$2,600
2	3,100
3	3,600
4	4,100
5	4,600
6	5,100
6+	For each indi- vidual over 6 add \$500 to income level

^aBarr, Ralph. Iowa State Employment Service,
Des Moines, Iowa. Data on OYO. Private communica-
tion. Nov. 1968.

Some special problems were encountered by Des Moines in the placement of enrollees during June of 1968. There was a shortage of qualified applicants so the guidelines were waived for applicants from Des Moines Technical High School. Many youths over the guidelines were admitted.

A total of 315 youths were placed in the NYC program, 50 in YOC, 600 in OYO, and 190 in non-program jobs in the Des Moines area according to Frank Owens, Youth Employment Specialist with the Iowa State Employment Service.¹ Only 190 placements out of a total placement of 1,155 were in non-program jobs. This gives some idea of the employment gap filled by the OYO program.

Community Improvement Inc. was able to reach a significant number of

¹Owens, Frank. Iowa State Employment Service, Des Moines, Iowa. Data on OYO. Private communication. March 1969.

disadvantaged youth. Over 125 of the enrollees or almost 25 percent were from families on some type of public assistance. Over 50 percent came from minority groups. Ten percent indicated they would not be returning to school in the fall and 33.5 percent were from households with more than six members. In 44.9 percent of the families the family head had less than a high school education. In 43.4 percent of the families at least one parent was missing or not living at home. Of all enrollees, 89 had had some contact with the Des Moines police before their enrollment in the program. All these figures indicate a significant number of disadvantaged youth were enrolled.¹

Des Moines also had a significant number of enrollees in their program who may not have been disadvantaged, at least, according to measures available to this evaluation.

Table 3.2 compares the family incomes reported from the parents and the Iowa State Department of Revenue with the family income-family size guidelines in Table 3.1. Family size was determined from Questionnaire I (Appendix A). Fifteen percent of the enrollees exceeded the income guidelines by more than \$300 according to their parents reported income to OYO. These youths were admitted to the program despite a knowledge by program officials that they exceeded the guidelines. Four percent exceeded the guidelines by over \$1,500 according to the parents' reports.

The second measure used to detect those over the guidelines was the Department of Revenue family income figures from income tax reports. Of incomes located by the Iowa State Department of Revenue, 63.4 percent were

¹For a more complete description of personal and family characteristics, see Appendix B.

Table 3.2. Comparison of family income reports with the family income-family size guidelines for Des Moines Operation Youth Opportunity^a

	Parents report	% of reported	Cum. % of reported	% of all parents
Not available	126	-	-	27.8
Below guidelines by				
4500 +	2	.6	.6	.4
2501-4500	26	7.9	8.5	5.7
1501-2500	61	18.6	27.1	13.4
1001-1500	67	20.4	47.5	14.8
601-1000	27	8.2	55.7	5.9
301-600	31	9.5	65.2	6.8
At guidelines	48	14.6	79.8	10.6
Above guidelines by				
301-600	17	5.2	85.0	3.7
601-1000	14	4.3	89.3	3.1
1001-1500	15	4.6	93.9	3.3
1501-2500	7	2.1	96.0	1.5
2501-3500	7	2.1	98.1	1.5
3501-6500	3	.9	99.0	.7
6500 +	3	.9	99.9	.7
Total ^c	454			

^aSource: Operation Youth Opportunity parents confidential financial forms (Appendix C) and the Iowa State Department of Revenue.

^bThe commulative percentage totals may not add to 100.0 percent in this and following tables due to rounding of percentage.

^cThe figures reported in Chapter III and Appendix B only include those enrollees who completed a questionnaire. The response rate ranged from 70 to 95 percent of the enrollees.

Cum. % of all parents	Dept. of Revenue report	% of reported	Cum. % of ^b reported	% of all enrollees	Cum. % of all enrollees
27.8	375	-	-	81.3	81.3
28.2	1	1.2	1.2	.2	81.5
33.9	2	2.3	3.5	.4	81.9
47.3	6	7.3	10.8	1.3	83.2
62.1	6	7.3	18.1	1.3	84.5
68.0	4	4.6	22.7	.9	85.4
74.8	2	2.3	25.0	.4	85.8
85.4	5	5.8	30.8	1.08	86.6
89.1	5	5.8	36.6	1.1	88.7
92.2	3	3.6	40.2	.6	88.3
95.5	8	9.3	49.5	1.7	90.0
97.0	7	8.1	57.6	1.5	91.5
98.5	16	18.6	76.2	3.5	95.0
99.2	8	9.3	85.5	1.7	97.7
99.9	13	15.1	100.6	2.8	100.5
	461				

over the guidelines in Table 3.1 by at least \$300. It must be remembered that only 19 percent of the family incomes were located and that the incomes located tend to be the higher incomes because of non-reporting of income by low-income families and families on welfare. Taking this into consideration, it can still be stated at the very least 11.3 percent of all enrollees in OYO exceeded the family income guidelines looking at the percentages of all enrollees in Table 3.2. Some returns for high income families were not located by the Department of Revenue so the actual percentage of those exceeding the income guidelines in Des Moines is probably somewhere between the 11.3 percent figure and 50.0 percent of the enrollees.

The family income figures for Operation Youth Opportunity are given in Table 3.3. The reported incomes by enrollees, parents and the Department of Revenue are included. Nineteen enrollees or 4.1 percent of all enrollees had incomes between \$10,000-\$15,000 and 37 or 8.0 percent had incomes between \$8,000-\$15,000 according to the State Department of Revenue reports. These families could hardly be called economically disadvantaged.

All programs had policies of admitting youths over the income guidelines if special personal or family circumstances warranted this. Table 3.4 examines some personal and family characteristics of the enrollees in Des Moines who exceeded the family income guidelines according to the State Department of Revenue figures. These characteristics may or may not explain why a portion of the enrollees were admitted despite being over the guidelines.

Fifty-six percent of those exceeding the guidelines were non-white compared to 51.8 percent of all enrollees (Appendix B). All who reported indicated they expected at least a high school diploma. Over fifty percent

Table 3.3. Family income as reported by enrollees, parents, and the State Department of Revenue for Des Moines' Operation Youth Opportunity^a

Incomes	Enrollees report	% of those reporting	Cum. % of those reporting	% of all enrollees	Cum. % of all enrollees	Parents report	% of those reporting
No report	243	0.0	0.0	52.2	52.2	126	0.0
100-2000	10	4.5	4.5	2.1	54.4	26	7.7
2001-3000	40	18.0	22.5	8.3	62.7	62	18.3
3001-3400	8	3.6	26.1	1.7	64.4	28	8.3
3401-3800	21	9.5	35.6	4.5	68.9	44	13.0
3801-4200	21	9.5	45.0	4.5	73.4	44	13.0
4201-4600	5	2.3	47.3	1.1	74.5	13	3.8
4601-5000	20	9.0	56.3	4.3	78.8	38	11.2
5001-5400	7	3.2	59.4	1.5	80.3	10	2.9
5401-5800	5	2.3	61.7	1.1	81.4	11	3.2
5801-6200	23	10.4	72.0	4.9	86.3	23	6.8
6201-6600	5	2.3	74.3	1.1	87.4	9	2.7
6601-7000	18	8.1	82.4	3.8	91.2	16	4.7
7001-8000	8	3.6	86.0	1.7	92.9	7	2.1
8001-10,000	15	6.8	92.7	3.2	96.1	5	1.5
10,001-15,000	16	7.2	100.0	3.4	100.0	1	.3
15,000 +	0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	2	.6
Total	465					465	

^aSource: Project I-TRY Questionnaire I (Appendix A), Operation Youth Opportunity parents confidential income reports (Appendix C), and the Iowa State Department of Revenue.

Incomes	Cum. % of those reporting	% of all enrollees	Cum. % of all enrollees	Dept. of Revenue report	% with income reported	Cum. % with income reported	% of all enrollees	Cum. % of all enrollees
No report	0.0	27.5	27.5	375	0.0	0.0	80.6	80.6
100-2000	7.7	5.5	33.0	5	5.6	5.6	1.1	81.7
2001-3000	25.9	13.3	46.3	3	3.3	8.9	.6	82.3
3001-3400	34.2	6.0	52.4	4	4.4	13.3	.9	83.2
3401-3800	47.2	9.5	61.8	1	1.1	14.4	.2	83.4
3801-4200	60.1	9.5	71.3	5	5.6	20.0	1.1	84.5
4201-4600	69.0	2.8	74.1	5	5.6	25.5	1.1	85.6
4601-5000	75.2	8.2	82.2	3	3.3	28.9	.6	86.2
5001-5400	78.1	2.1	84.4	1	1.1	30.0	.2	86.4
5401-5800	81.3	2.4	86.7	5	5.6	35.5	1.1	87.5
5801-6200	88.1	4.9	91.6	3	3.3	39.0	.6	88.2
6201-6600	90.8	1.9	93.6	5	5.6	44.4	1.1	89.2
6601-7000	95.5	3.4	97.0	4	4.4	48.8	.9	90.1
7001-8000	97.5	1.5	98.5	9	10.0	58.8	1.9	92.0
8001-10,000	99.0	1.1	99.6	18	20.0	78.8	3.9	95.9
10,001-15,000	99.3	.2	99.8	19	21.1	99.9	4.1	100.0
15,000 +	100.0	.4	100.0	0	0.0	99.9	0.0	100.0
Total				465				

Table 3.4. Characteristics of enrollees exceeding family income guidelines for Des Moines^a

Age	<u>14</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>19</u>			
Number	12	21	12	7	0	1			
%	22.6	39.6	22.6	13.2	0.0	1.9			
Sex	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>							
Number	31	22							
%	58.5	41.5							
Race	<u>White</u>	<u>Non-white</u>	<u>No response</u> ^b						
Number	22	28	3						
%	44.0	56.0	-						
Education - Grade	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>No response</u>				
Number	13	16	15	7	2				
%	25.5	31.4	29.5	13.7	-				
School status	<u>Returning to school</u>		<u>Not returning</u>		<u>No response</u>				
Number	51		0		2				
%	100.0		0.0		-				
Expected future education - years	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>College</u>	<u>Graduate work</u>	<u>No response</u>			
Number	14	1	7	19	3	4			
%	31.9	2.3	15.9	43.2	6.8	-			
Number in household	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12+</u>
Number	2	12	6	15	9	4	2	1	2
%	3.8	22.6	11.3	28.3	16.9	7.5	3.8	1.9	3.8
Parental status	<u>Father at home</u>	<u>Father deceased</u>	<u>Father not living at home</u>						
Number	49	2	2						
%	92.4	3.8	3.8						
	<u>Mother at home</u>	<u>Mother deceased</u>	<u>Mother not living at home</u>						
Number	49	1	3						
%	92.4	1.9	5.7						

^aSource: Project I-TRY Questionnaire I.^bNo response is not included in the percentages.

Table 3.4. (Continued)

Social class	<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>	<u>IV</u>	<u>V</u>	<u>Not available</u>
Number	0	1	6	27	7	12
%	0.0	2.4	14.6	65.9	17.1	-
Problems with school or law authorities						
Number	6					
%	11.3					

expected to attend college. Eighteen or 34.9 percent came from families larger than six compared to 33.5 percent of all Des Moines participants. At least one parent was missing in 7.6 percent of the homes among these enrollees compared to 46.4 percent of all enrollees in the program. Of the enrollees exceeding the guidelines, 17.1 percent would be classified into social class V, the lower class and 65.9 percent fell into the lower middle class. The enrollees from minority groups, large families, and the lower social class may be disadvantaged but the preceding figures tend to indicate that less than 50 percent of those enrollees exceeding the guidelines could be considered disadvantaged according to the above criteria.

The high expectations for future education, the small number with parents missing, and the small number in the lower social class seem to indicate that most of the enrollees over the guidelines were not disadvantaged.

Cedar Rapids' Youth Employment Services

The Cedar Rapids' Youth Employment Services Program (YES) was designed to fill the need for summer employment for youths from low income families, for youths having problems with law authorities, and for youths with special family problems.

Program participants were located through the four neighborhood centers in Cedar Rapids, a local privately endowed community house, the local employment service office, churches, and referrals from school counselors. The radio, television, and newspaper media were used to advertise for applicants. Four-hundred applications were filed for the 200 job slots.

The screening of the applicants took place at two neighborhood centers by a screening committee composed of a neighborhood worker, a community worker, Leo Owens (YES Project Director), a businessman, and a minister. The schools and probation officers were contacted for information about applicants. The applicants were placed in NYC if eligible, then YES if eligible.

The youths had to meet the family size-family income guidelines in Table 3.5 to be eligible for employment with YES. Ten percent of the income requirement could be waived if the youth had special problems (e.g. family, mental health, probation, or police problems or a family services referral). The family income-family size eligibility was determined from the application form (Appendix C) completed by the youth and signed by his parents.

A large number of disadvantaged youth were reached in the YES program as is indicated by the following statistics. Forty-seven out of 226 enrollees indicated they were non-white and a large number of the 42 enrollees who did not respond to this question were probably also non-white.

Table 3.5. Youth Employment Services'
family income-family size
guidelines^a

Family size	Family income
1	1600
2	2000
3	2500
4	3200
5	3800
6	4200
7	4700
8	5300
8 +	Add \$500 for each additional family member

^aSource: See Youth Employment
Services' application form in Appendix
C.

Five percent did not plan to return to school. The family size was greater than six for 36.3 percent of the enrollees. The family head had less than a high school education in 63 families or 37.9 percent. At least one parent was missing or not living at home in 40.5 percent of the families. Sixty of the enrollees had had some contact with the Cedar Rapids police before entering the program. The preceding figures would indicate at least 50 percent of the enrollees could be considered disadvantaged according to the above criterion.¹

Cedar Rapids had a large number of enrollees who exceeded the income guidelines in Table 3.5. Table 3.6 compares the family incomes as reported

¹See Appendix B for a more complete description of the personal and family characteristics of the enrollees.

Table 3.6. Comparison of reported income with the family income-family size guidelines for Cedar Rapids' Youth Employment Services

	Dept. of Revenue report	% of reported	Cum. % of reported	% of all enrollees	Cum. % of all enrollees
Not available	131	-	-	66.4	66.4
Below guidelines by					
4500 +	0	-	-	-	66.4
2501-4500	2	2.9	2.9	1.0	67.4
1501-2500	3	4.3	7.2	1.5	69.0
1001-1500	0	-	7.2	-	69.0
601-1000	1	1.4	8.7	.5	69.5
301-600	0	-	8.7	-	69.5
At guidelines	5	7.2	15.9	2.5	72.0
Over guidelines by					
301-600	5	7.2	23.1	2.5	74.6
601-1000	5	7.2	30.4	2.5	77.1
1001-1500	5	7.2	37.6	2.5	79.6
1501-2500	8	11.6	49.2	4.1	83.7
2501-3500	14	20.3	69.5	6.1	89.8
3501-6500	11	15.9	85.4	5.1	94.9
6501 +	10	14.5	99.9	5.1	99.9

^aSource: Iowa State Department of Revenue.

by the Department of Revenue with the family income-family size guidelines. Looking at the State Department of Revenue figures, 76.9 percent of the reported incomes were over the program guidelines. This constituted 26.4 percent of all enrollees. The guidelines were exceeded by at least \$1,000 by 62.4 percent of the enrollees with incomes reported. It must be remembered that the incomes located by the Department of Revenue tended to be the ones in the upper income ranges because of non-reporting by low-income families and families on welfare. Because of incomplete names for some

enrollees' parents and lack of social security numbers for parents, the Department of Revenue also missed a number of high incomes. The lowest possible percentage for those exceeding the family income guideline in YES is 26.4 percent and the actual figure could range as high as 50 percent.

Table 3.7 gives a listing of the family incomes as reported by the enrollees and the State Department of Revenue for YES. Of the family incomes available from the State Department of Revenue, 74.1 percent were above \$5,000 or 25.1 percent of all enrollees. Twenty-seven enrollees had family incomes above \$8,000. Thirty-nine or 56.8 percent of the enrollees with incomes reported had family incomes over \$7,000. This was 19.5 percent of all enrollees. A large number of youths in YES could not be called economically disadvantaged.

Table 3.8 looks at the personal and family characteristics of those YES enrollees who exceeded the family income guidelines according to tax return figures. According to the criteria below these youth may or may not be considered disadvantaged. Fourteen enrollees and possibly a number of the 14 not responding to this question were non-white. This is larger than the 25 percent of all enrollees plus non-respondents who were non-white for the whole program. Only one enrollee indicated he would not return to school. All but one enrollee expected to receive at least a high school education while 36.1 percent expect to graduate from college. Twenty-three or 47.1 percent came from families with more than 6 members compared to 36.3 percent of all enrollees. Twenty-five or 48.1 percent fall into the lower social class. Because of family size, social class, race, and missing parents, about 50 percent could be considered somewhat disadvantaged. A large number of enrollees not disadvantaged by the preceding criteria were in the YES program.

Table 3.7. Family income as reported by enrollees and the State Department of Revenue for Cedar Rapids^a Youth Employment Services

Incomes	Enrollees report	% of those reporting	Cum. % of those reporting	% of all enrollees
No report	108	-	-	54.0
100-2000	3	3.3	-	1.5
2001-3000	12	13.0	16.3	6.0
3001-3400	5	5.4	21.7	2.5
3401-3800	8	8.7	30.4	4.0
3801-4200	9	9.8	40.2	4.5
4201-4600	6	6.5	46.7	3.0
4601-5000	9	9.8	56.5	4.5
5001-5400	4	4.3	60.8	2.0
5401-5800	6	6.5	67.3	3.0
5801-6200	9	9.7	77.0	4.5
6201-6600	6	6.5	83.5	3.0
6601-7000	4	4.3	87.8	2.0
7001-8000	3	3.3	91.1	1.5
8001-10,000	7	7.6	98.7	3.5
10,001-15,000	1	1.1	99.8	.5
15,000 +	0	-	-	-
Total	200			

^aSource: Project I-TRY Questionnaire I (Appendix A) and the Iowa State Department of Revenue.

Cum. % of all enrollees	Dept. of Revenue report	% with income reported	Cum. % with income reported	% of all enrollees	Cum. % of all enrollees
-	131	-	-	65.5	65.5
55.5	4	5.8	5.8	2.0	67.5
61.5	1	1.4	7.2	.5	68.0
64.0	5	7.2	14.4	2.5	70.5
68.0	3	4.3	18.7	1.5	72.0
72.5	0	-	18.7	-	72.0
75.5	3	4.3	23.0	1.5	73.5
80.0	2	2.9	25.9	1.0	74.5
82.0	1	1.4	27.3	.5	75.0
85.0	2	2.9	30.2	1.0	76.0
89.5	4	5.8	36.0	2.0	78.0
92.5	2	2.9	38.9	1.0	79.0
94.5	3	4.3	43.2	1.5	80.5
96.0	12	17.4	60.6	6.0	86.5
99.5	17	24.6	85.2	8.5	95.0
100.0	9	13.0	98.2	4.5	99.5
-	1	1.4	99.6	.5	100.0
	200				

Table 3.8. Characteristics of enrollees exceeding family income guidelines for Cedar Rapids' Youth Employment Services^a

Age	<u>14</u>		<u>15</u>		<u>16</u>		<u>17</u>		<u>18</u>	
Number	19		18		13		8		3	
%	31.1		29.5		21.3		13.1		4.9	
Sex	<u>Male</u>				<u>Female</u>					
Number	42				19					
%	68.9				31.1					
Race	<u>White</u>			<u>Non-white</u>			<u>No response</u>			
Number	33			14			14			
%	70.0			30.0			-			
Education - Grade	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>		
Number	1	6	10	18	16	5	1	1		
%	1.7	10.3	17.2	31.0	27.6	8.6	1.7	1.7		
School status	<u>Returning to school</u>					<u>Not returning</u>			<u>No response</u>	
Number	58					1			3	
%	98.3					1.7			-	
Expected future education - years	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>College</u>	<u>Graduate work</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>No response</u>	
Number	1	0	17	0	5	19	2	14	3	
%	1.7	0.0	29.4	0.0	8.6	32.7	3.4	24.1	-	
Number in household	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>
Number	1	7	13	8	9	3	3	11	3	3
%	1.6	11.5	21.3	13.1	14.8	4.9	4.9	18.0	4.9	4.9
Parental status	<u>Father at home</u>			<u>Father deceased</u>		<u>Father not living at home</u>			<u>No response</u>	
Number	48			4		7			2	
%	80.0			7.0		13.0			-	
	<u>Mother at home</u>			<u>Mother deceased</u>		<u>Mother not living at home</u>			<u>No response</u>	
Number	56			1		2			2	
%	95.0			1.7		3.4			-	

^aSource: Project I-TRY Questionnaire I.

Table 3.8. (Continued)

Social class	<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>	<u>IV</u>	<u>V</u>
Number	0	1	1	25	25
%	0.0	1.9	1.9	48.1	48.1
Problems with school or law authorities					
Number	13				
%	11.3				

Waterloo's Metropolitan Improvement Services, Inc.

In Waterloo, program administrators felt that the Metropolitan Improvement Services, Inc. Program (MIS) would fill the employment needs of 14 and 15 year old youths too young to be eligible for the Neighborhood Youth Corps and too young and inexperienced to compete with older youths for jobs available from other sources. Also it was felt that some youths needed assistance finding employment even if they did not meet the guidelines for Neighborhood Youth Corps.

The jobs were advertised through newspapers, radio, television, the schools, and community houses. Youths were referred to the program by the schools, community houses, juvenile officers, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and social workers as part of an outreach system. A total of 517 applications were received at the schools, community houses, and the Iowa State Employment Service for the 140 job slots.

The 140 enrollees were selected by a screening committee composed of a juvenile officer, the director of guidance for the public schools, NYC representatives, Jesse Cosby Center representatives, an Iowa State Employment

Service representative, social workers, and ministers. Because of the varied background of the members of the screening committee and their work with the disadvantaged in Waterloo, the committee had a personal knowledge of the situation of most applicants. Family income, family size, and a knowledge of the needy applicants was used to determine eligibility for the MIS program. No direct question about family income was asked on application forms but the youths were asked to indicate their family size and place of employment of their father and mother. The family income was estimated from a knowledge of wage rates in the Waterloo area.¹

An examination of the personal and family characteristics of the enrollees in Waterloo reveals many characteristics indicating many enrollees were disadvantaged. Over 50 percent of the enrollees were non-white. Seventy-two enrollees or 67.7 percent came from households with more than six people. In 38.5 percent of the households, the family head had less than a high school education. At least one parent was missing in 42.2 percent of the homes.²

Although the above figures indicate many enrollees were disadvantaged, a large number of enrollees had high family incomes. Table 3.9 gives the family incomes as reported for Waterloo by the enrollees and by the Department of Revenue. Twenty-four enrollees had incomes above \$6,200 according to Department of Revenue figures. These enrollees comprised 21.6 percent of the youth in the program and 72.8 percent of the enrollees with income

¹See Appendix C for a copy of the application form used to determine eligibility.

²Appendix B gives a more complete description of personal and family characteristics of the enrollees.

Table 3.9. Family income as reported by enrollees and the State Department of Revenue for Waterloo's MIS program^a

Incomes	Enrollees report	% of those reporting	Cum. % of those reporting	% of all enrollees
No report	67	-	-	60.4
100-2000	0	-	-	-
2001-3000	4	9.1	-	3.6
3001-3400	0	-	-	-
3401-3800	5	11.4	20.5	4.5
3801-4200	2	4.5	25.0	1.8
4201-4600	3	6.8	31.8	2.7
4601-5000	4	9.1	40.9	3.6
5001-5400	0	-	-	-
5401-5800	1	2.3	43.2	.9
5801-6200	7	15.9	59.1	6.3
6201-6600	2	4.5	63.6	1.8
6601-7000	4	9.1	72.7	3.6
7001-8000	8	18.2	90.9	7.2
8001-10,000	2	4.5	95.4	1.8
10,001-15,000	2	4.5	99.9	1.8
15,000 +	0	-	-	-
Total				

^aSource: Iowa State Department of Revenue and Project I-TRY Questionnaire I (Appendix A).

Cum. % of all enrollees	Dept. of Revenue report	% with income reported	Cum. % with income reported	% of all enrollees	Cum. % of all enrollees
	78	-	-	70.3	-
	4	12.1		3.6	73.9
64.0	1	3.0	15.1	.9	74.8
	0	-	-	-	
68.5	0	-	-	-	
70.3	1	3.0	18.1	.9	75.7
73.0	1	3.0	21.1	.9	76.6
76.6	0	-	-	-	
	0	-	-	-	
77.5	2	6.1	27.2	1.8	78.4
83.8	0	-	-	-	
85.6	4	12.1	39.3	3.6	82.0
89.2	0	-	-	-	
96.4	13	39.4	78.7	11.7	93.7
98.2	3	9.1	87.8	2.7	96.4
100.0	4	12.1	99.9	3.6	100.0
-	0	-	-	-	-

data available. A warning must again be given that the available income figures are skewed towards the upper income ranges because of non-reporting of income by low-income and welfare families.

In Waterloo income information was available for over 300 youth not selected by the screening committee for summer employment. Table 3.10 gives the reported incomes for this group. Of the reported incomes in this group 87.3 percent were above \$6,200 according to Department of Revenue income figures and 8.5 percent were below \$5,000. It appears that some youths with low family incomes may have been overlooked in the selection process.

The Waterloo enrollees and the applicants not selected were compared with the guidelines for the Des Moines program in Table 3.1 to give a measure of the economically disadvantaged among MIS enrollees. The Des Moines guidelines were not used or suggested for use in Waterloo. They are used only for a guide to comparison.

Table 3.11 shows that at least 21.1 percent of Waterloo's enrollees would have exceeded Des Moines' guidelines. Eight enrollees plus a percentage of the 78 enrollees with no family income reported would be in the low income range and able to meet the guidelines in Table 3.1. The actual number exceeding these guidelines would be between 21.1 percent and 50.0 percent of all enrollees.

Table 3.12 examines the personal and family characteristics of those youths who would have exceeded the Des Moines family income-family size guideline. The non-white percentage of enrollees over the guidelines was 31.8 percent compared to approximately 50 percent for all enrollees. All were planning to return to school in the fall. A very large percentage, 87.4, came from large families of over six members. One parent was missing

Table 3.10. Family income as reported by the youths not selected and the State Department of Revenue figures for these youths not selected for Waterloo's MIS program^a

Incomes	Enrollees report	% of those reporting	Cum. % of those reporting	% of all enrollees
No report	101	-	-	27.3
100-2000	5	1.9	-	1.4
2001-3000	4	1.5	3.4	1.1
3001-3400	4	1.5	4.9	1.1
3401-3800	12	4.6	9.5	3.3
3801-4200	9	3.4	12.9	2.5
4201-4600	0	1.9	14.8	1.4
4601-5000	29	11.1	25.9	8.0
5001-5400	2	.8	26.7	.6
5401-5800	6	2.3	29.0	1.7
5801-6200	22	8.4	37.4	6.1
6201-6600	9	3.4	40.8	2.5
6601-7000	30	11.5	52.3	8.3
7001-8000	42	16.0	68.3	11.6
8001-10,000	48	18.3	86.6	13.2
10,001-15,000	30	11.5	98.1	8.3
15,000 +	5	1.9	100.0	1.4
Total				

^aSource: Iowa State Department of Revenue and Project I-TRY Questionnaire I.

Cum. % of all enrollees	Dept. of Revenue report	% with income reported	Cum. % with income reported	% of all enrollees	Cum. % of all enrollees
-	173	-	-	47.6	-
28.7	5	2.6	-	1.4	49.0
29.9	2	1.1	3.7	.6	49.7
31.0	0	-	3.7	-	49.7
34.3	1	.5	4.2	.3	50.0
36.8	2	1.1	5.3	.6	50.6
38.2	4	2.1	7.4	1.1	51.7
46.0	2	1.1	8.5	.6	52.3
46.6	1	.5	9.0	1.1	53.4
48.3	4	2.1	11.1	1.1	54.5
54.4	3	1.6	12.7	.8	55.3
56.9	7	3.7	16.4	1.9	57.2
65.2	7	3.7	20.1	1.9	59.1
76.8	26	13.7	33.8	7.2	66.3
90.0	53	27.9	61.7	14.6	80.9
98.3	61	32.1	93.8	16.8	97.7
99.7	12	6.3	100.1	3.0	100.7

Table 3.11. Comparison of family income reports with the family income-family size guidelines for Waterloo MIS enrollees^a

	Dept. of Revenue report	% of reported	Cum. % of reported	% of all enrollees	Cum. % of enrollees
Not available	78	-	-	70.9	70.9
Below guidelines by					
4500 +	2	6.3	6.3	1.8	72.7
2501-4500	2	6.3	12.5	1.8	74.5
1501-2500	0	-	12.5	-	74.5
1001-1500	0	-	12.5	-	74.5
601-1000	1	3.1	15.6	.9	75.4
301-600	2	6.3	21.9	1.8	77.2
At guidelines	1	3.1	25.0	.9	78.1
Above guidelines by					
301-600	2	6.3	31.2	1.8	79.9
601-1000	0	-	31.2	-	79.9
1001-1500	8	25.0	56.2	7.3	87.2
1501-2500	7	21.9	78.1	6.4	93.6
2501-3500	4	12.5	90.6	3.6	97.2
3501-6500	3	9.4	99.9	2.7	99.9
6500 +	0	-	99.9	-	99.9
Total	110				

^aSource: The Iowa State Department of Revenue and Table 3.1.

in 23.8 percent of the homes. A total of 11 enrollees or 64.7 percent were in the lower social class. Family size, missing parents, and low social classes indicate that as many as 90 percent of these enrollees may be disadvantaged according to some of the above criterion while exceeding the income guidelines.

Table 3.12. Characteristics of enrollees exceeding a family income guideline for Waterloo MIS enrollees^a

Age	<u>14</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>16</u>					
Number	14	6	2					
%	63.6	27.3	9.1					
Sex	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>						
Number	21	1						
%	95.5	4.5						
Race	<u>White</u>	<u>Non-white</u>						
Number	15	7						
%	68.2	31.8						
Education - Grade	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>					
Number	12	8	2					
%	54.5	36.4	9.1					
School status	<u>Returning to school</u>		<u>Not returning</u>					
Number	22		0					
%	100.0		0.0					
Expected future education - years	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>College</u>	<u>Other</u>			
Number	11	1	2	6	2			
%	50.0	4.5	9.1	27.3	9.1			
Number in household	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>
Number	1	1	3	5	6	2	0	4
%	4.5	4.5	13.6	22.7	27.3	9.1	0.0	18.2
Parental status	<u>Father at home</u>	<u>Father deceased</u>	<u>Father not living at home</u>		<u>No response</u>			
Number	16	0	5		1			
%	76.2	0.0	23.8		-			
	<u>Mother at home</u>	<u>Mother deceased</u>	<u>Mother not living at home</u>					
Number	22	0	0					
%	100.0	0.0						

^aSource: Project I-TRY Questionnaire I.

Table 3.12. (Continued)

Social class	<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>	<u>IV</u>	<u>V</u>
Number	0	0	2	4	11
%	0.0	0.0	11.8	23.5	64.7
Problems with school or law authorities					
Number	5				
%	13.7				

Davenport Community Pride Inc.

In the Davenport Community Pride Inc. Program (CPI), all unemployed youth between 14-21 were eligible for employment. A priority was given to disadvantaged and minority group youth. Applicants were referred to CPI by the schools, NYC and The Friendly House. CPI did the screening for the program. The youths were admitted if they met the OEO income guidelines or if they were referred to the program because of special needs.

This evaluation of selection includes only those 60 youths in the Play Corps portion of the CPI program. The personal and family characteristics of the Play Corps leaders indicate that many disadvantaged youth were employed by Play Corps. Almost 50 percent of the enrollees were non-white. Thirty enrollees or 50 percent came from families larger than six members. The family head had less than a high school education in 50 percent of the families. In 16 families one parent was missing.¹ There were some youths from high income families in the Play Corps program.

According to Table 3.13, 10 enrollees had family incomes above \$7,000

¹See Appendix B for a complete description of enrollee characteristics.

Table 3.13. Family income as reported by enrollees and the State Department of Revenue for Davenport Play Corps enrollees^a

Incomes	Enrollees report	% of those reporting	Cum. % of those reporting	% of all enrollees
No report	33	-	-	55.0
100-2000	2	7.4	-	3.3
2001-3000	2	7.4	14.8	3.3
3001-3400	0	-	14.8	-
3401-3800	1	3.7	18.5	1.7
3801-4200	3	11.1	29.6	5.0
4201-4600	0	-	29.6	-
4601-5000	4	14.8	44.4	6.7
5001-5400	0	-	44.4	-
5401-5800	3	11.1	55.5	5.0
5801-6200	4	14.8	70.3	6.7
6201-6600	0	-	70.3	-
6601-7000	2	7.4	77.7	3.3
7001-8000	2	7.4	85.1	3.3
8001-10,000	3	11.1	96.2	5.0
10,001-15,000	0	-	96.2	-
15,000 +	1	3.7	99.9	1.7
Total	60			

^aSource: Project I-TRY Questionnaire I and the Iowa State Department of Revenue.

Cum. % of all enrollees	Dept. of Revenue report	% with income reported	Cum. % with income reported	% of all enrollees	Cum. % of all enrollees
<hr/>					
55.0	44	-	-	73.3	73.3
58.3	2	12.5	12.5	3.3	76.6
61.6	0	-	12.5	-	76.6
61.6	0	-	12.5	-	76.6
63.3	0	-	12.5	-	76.6
68.3	1	6.3	18.8	1.7	78.3
68.3	0	-	18.8	-	78.3
75.0	0	-	18.8	-	78.3
75.0	0	-	18.8	-	78.3
80.0	1	6.3	25.1	1.7	80.0
86.7	1	6.3	31.4	1.7	81.7
86.7	1	6.3	37.7	1.7	83.4
90.0	0	-	37.7	-	83.4
93.3	2	12.5	50.2	3.3	86.7
98.3	4	25.0	75.2	6.7	93.4
98.3	3	18.8	94.0	5.0	95.4
100.0	1	6.3	100.3	1.7	100.1

using Department of Revenue income reports. Three enrollees had family incomes between \$10,000 to \$15,000 and one enrollee had a family income greater than \$15,000.

The enrollees who exceeded the guidelines set in Table 3.1 are shown in Table 3.14. At least 15.0 percent of all enrollees exceeded the income guidelines used in the Des Moines program. Three exceeded those guidelines by over \$6,500. Of the 12 who exceeded the guidelines, six were paid by Neighborhood Youth Corps funds.

The personal and family characteristics of the six youths paid by Community Pride Inc. who were over the Des Moines guidelines are given in Table 3.15. The Des Moines guidelines were used in this evaluation to give a general guide to who might be economically disadvantaged. These guidelines were not suggested for or used in Davenport.

The personal and family characteristics in Table 3.15 did not indicate a large portion of these youth being disadvantaged. Thirty-three percent were non-white. All expected to return to school. All expected at least a high school education. Thirty-three percent came from families with over six members. One was missing a parent. Two fell into the lower social class.

A significant statistic in Davenport was the fact that six Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees in Play Corps could not meet the family income-family size guidelines in Table 3.1 which are more liberal than the NYC guidelines. It appears the federal program was not able or willing to screen out the enrollees with high incomes.

Table 3.14. Comparison of family income reports with the family income-family size guidelines for Davenport Play Corps enrollees^a

	Dept. of Revenue report	% of reported	Cum. % of reported	% of all enrollees	Cum. % of enrollees
Not available	44	-	-	73.3	73.3
Below guidelines by					
4500 +	0	-	-	-	73.3
2501-4500	2	12.5	12.5	3.3	76.6
1501-2500	1	6.3	18.8	1.7	78.3
1001-1500	0	-	18.8	-	78.3
601-1000	0	-	18.8	-	78.3
301-600	1	6.3	25.1	1.7	80.0
At guidelines	0	-	25.1	-	80.0
Above guidelines by					
301-600	0	-	25.1	-	80.0
601-1000	0	-	25.1	-	80.0
1001-1500	3	18.8	43.9	5.0	85.0
1501-2500	3	18.8	62.7	5.0	90.0
2501-3500	1	6.3	69.0	1.7	91.7
3501-6500	2	12.5	81.5	3.3	95.0
6500 +	3	18.8	100.0	5.0	100.0

^aSource: The Iowa State Department of Revenue.

Summary and comparison of selected characteristics
of I-TRY enrollees in the four programs

Cedar Rapids had the largest percentage of enrollees over the income guidelines according to available family income figures. Waterloo had the smallest percentage over the guidelines of those with family income figures available and the second smallest percentage of all enrollees over the guidelines.

Des Moines had the largest percentage of non-whites among all enrollees and among those enrollees over the family income guidelines. Waterloo was

Table 3.15. Characteristics of enrollees exceeding family income guidelines for the Play Corps enrollees paid by CPI^a

Age	<u>14</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>16</u>		
Number	1	4	1		
%	16.7	66.7	16.7		
Sex	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>			
Number	3	3			
%	50.0	50.0			
Race	<u>White</u>	<u>Non-white</u>			
Number	4	2			
%	66.7	33.3			
Education - Grade	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>		
Number	1	1	4		
%	16.7	16.7	66.7		
School status	<u>Returning to school</u>	<u>Not returning</u>			
Number	6	0			
%	100.0	0.0			
Expected future education	<u>High school</u>	<u>College</u>	<u>Other</u>		
Number	2	3	1		
%	33.3	50.0	16.7		
Number in household	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>
Number	2	1	1	1	1
%	33.3	16.7	16.7	16.7	16.7
Parental status	<u>Father at home</u>	<u>Father deceased</u>	<u>Father not living at home</u>		
Number	5	0	1		
%	84.3	0.0	16.7		
	<u>Mother at home</u>	<u>Mother deceased</u>	<u>Mother not living at home</u>		
Number	6	0	0		
%	100.0	0.0	0.0		

^aSource: Project I-TRY Questionnaire I (Appendix A).

Table 3.15. (Continued)

Social class	<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>	<u>IV</u>	<u>V</u>
Number	1	0	1	2	2
%	16.7	0.0	16.7	33.3	33.3
Problems with school and law authorities					
Number	1				
%	12.5				

Table 3.16. Summary of enrollees over the income guidelines by over \$300,
Department of Revenue figures^a

	% incomes located	Number exceeding guidelines	% of those with income figures available	% of all enrollees in the program
Des Moines' OYO	19.4	60	69.2	13.4
Cedar Rapid's YES	34.5	58	84.1	28.0
Waterloo's MIS	29.7	24	66.7	21.9
Davenport's Play Corps	30.0	12	75.0	25.0

^aSource: The preceding tables in Chapter III.

second in the percentage of non-white enrollees.

Des Moines had the largest number of school dropouts in their program. Cedar Rapids was second with 5.1 percent. Only Cedar Rapids had a school dropout among those enrollees exceeding the guidelines.

Waterloo had the largest percentage of enrollees from large families. Des Moines was third among all enrollees and second among those over the guidelines.

Table 3.17. Summary of race of all enrollees and those over the income guidelines^a

	% non-white of all enrollees in the program	% non-white of enrollees over guidelines
Des Moines' OYO	51.8	56.0
Cedar Rapids' YES	25.5	30-40
Waterloo's MIS	50.5	31.8
Davenport's Play Corps	40.5	25.0

^aSource: The preceding tables in Chapter III and Appendix B.

Table 3.18. Summary of enrollees dropping out of school^a

	% school dropouts of all enrollees in the program	% school dropouts of enrollees over guidelines
Des Moines' OYO	9.0	0.0
Cedar Rapids' YES	5.1	1.7
Waterloo's MIS	1.8	0.0
Davenport's Play Corps	1.9	0.0

^aSource: The preceding tables in Chapter III and Appendix B.

Des Moines had the largest percentage of enrollees with a parent missing, but the smallest percentage of enrollees over the guidelines with parents missing. Waterloo and Cedar Rapids were second and third in the percentage of all enrollees with parents missing and first and second in the percentage of those enrollees over the guidelines with parents missing.

Table 3.19. Summary of enrollees from households of over six members^a

	% of all enrollees in the program	% of enrollees over guidelines
Des Moines' OYO	33.5	43.9
Cedar Rapids' YES	36.3	37.6
Waterloo's MIS	66.1	77.3
Davenport's Play Corps	45.0	25.0

^aSource: The preceding tables in Chapter III and Appendix B.

Table 3.20. Summary of enrollees missing at least one parent^a

	% of all enrollees in the program	% of enrollees over guidelines
Des Moines' OYO	43.4	7.6
Cedar Rapids' YES	40.5	20.0
Waterloo's MIS	42.2	23.8
Davenport's Play Corps	27.1	16.7

^aSource: The preceding tables in Chapter III and Appendix B.

Waterloo had the largest percentage of those enrollees exceeding family incomes guidelines falling into lower social class. Cedar Rapids was second with 48.1 percent. The largest percentage of enrollees fell into the two lower classes in all four programs.

The preceding statistics indicate that Waterloo and Des Moines had the largest percentage of disadvantaged youths in their programs. Waterloo had

Table 3.21. Summary of social class of those enrollees over the income guidelines^a

	% in the lower middle class	% in the lower class
Des Moines' OYO	65.9	17.1
Cedar Rapids' YES	48.1	48.1
Waterloo's MIS	23.5	64.7
Davenport's Play Corps	37.5	37.5

^aSource: The preceding tables in Chapter III.

the smallest percentage over the income guidelines, the second largest percentage of non-white enrollees, the largest percentage of enrollees from large families, the second largest percentage with at least one parent missing, and the largest percentage of those over the income guidelines in the lower social class. A disadvantaged group not served in the Waterloo program was school dropouts.

Des Moines had the second smallest percentage of those over the guidelines, the largest percentage of non-whites, the largest percentage of school dropouts, and the second largest percentage from large families.

Cedar Rapids had the largest percentage over the guidelines, the smallest percentage of non-white enrollees, the second largest percentage of school dropouts, and the third largest percentage with at least one parent missing.

There may have been a smaller number of disadvantaged enrollees in YES because Cedar Rapids may have had less disadvantaged youths in their community to select from. Cedar Rapids has the lowest percentage of families

under \$5,000 income of all four cities (52, Table 76) and the lowest percentage of non-whites (51, Table 20).

The number of enrollees was too small in Davenport to give a valid comparison with the other cities.

A Summary of the Characteristics of all I-TRY Participants¹

Project I-TRY concentrated mainly on the employment of 14-16 year-olds. Ninety-four percent of the enrollees were in this age group. These teenagers have the most difficulty locating summer jobs and were willing to work for the comparatively low wage scales in the I-TRY programs. Three programs paid only \$1.00 per hour.

The number of jobs available for girls was less than for the boys. There were many outdoor jobs suitable for inexperienced workers but unsuitable for girls. Sixty-two percent of the enrollees were boys.

The percentage of non-white enrollees in the I-TRY programs was much larger than the percentage of non-whites in the total population of the four cities with I-TRY programs. About 45 percent of all I-TRY enrollees were non-white while the percentage of non-white youths among teenagers 14-19 years of age in all four cities combined was only 5.2 in 1966 (53, Table 2; 54, Table 2; 55, Table 2; 56, Table 2). The percentage of enrollees over the income guidelines who were non-white was also much larger than the percentage of the total population who were non-white. It appears that the non-white applicant found it easier to gain admission to the I-TRY

¹See Appendix B for a complete enumeration of statistics used in this section.

programs. As stated earlier, these programs were developed after the riots and civil disorders of 1967. The admission of large numbers of non-white youths to the I-TRY programs fits in well with the goal of reducing racial tensions in Iowa's major cities. The most militant group in the urban areas are not necessarily the low-income non-whites but the middle class blacks with high future expectations for employment and education. This group is easily frustrated by a lack of opportunity. I-TRY gave a number of these youths an opportunity for summer employment.

The largest portion of I-TRY participants were planning to return to school. Of all enrollees, only 4.6 percent had dropped out of school or were planning to drop out of school. One of the goals of the I-TRY program was to eliminate the financial and employment incentive to drop out of school. Economic problems and employment ranked high among Project I-TRY enrollees as reasons for dropping out of school. Thirty-three percent of those enrollees leaving school dropped out. A later publication of the I-TRY evaluation will assess the effect of the programs on the dropout problem.

Forty percent of all enrollees came from households with over six members. The average size of households was 6.15 people. The many enrollees from large families reflects an appreciation by the I-TRY programs for the special needs of these youths.

In 41 percent of the enrollees' families, the family head did not have a high school education. It is noteworthy that 99 percent of the enrollees hope to achieve this goal their parents may not have reached.

In at least 41.5 percent of the homes at least one parent was missing. Eleven percent of the enrollees' fathers were deceased while 31 percent were

not living at home for some other reason. A large number of enrollees came from families on welfare. The preceding statistics on broken homes reflect a welfare system that tends to split up the lower income family. Families may not be able to receive welfare payments if a male parent is living at home. The Project I-TRY programs recognized the problems of youths from broken homes by providing jobs for them.

An Evaluation of the Reliability of Parental and Enrollee Reports of Income for Use in Screening Applicants

In all the I-TRY programs, family income was one of the criteria for selection of enrollees. The correct determination of family income appears to have been a problem for all the programs. A comparison of the enrollees' income reports, the parents' income reports, and the income reports from the State Department of Revenue gave an opportunity to assess the accuracy of the use of the parents' and enrollees' reported income for screening youths into these programs. The comparisons are made in Table 3.22 for Des Moines and Table 3.23 for Cedar Rapids, Davenport, and Waterloo.

Table 3.22 indicates that 41 or 73.2 percent of the parents with income reports available reported less income to OYO than they did on their income tax forms. Ten parents or 17.9 percent reported at least \$4,500 less income to OYO than on their income tax forms. Thirty parents or 53.6 percent reported over \$1,000 less income to OYO. The figures should have been approximately the same since the parents filled out their income reports to OYO in May and June just after the deadline for filing state income tax reports for 1967. A discrepancy may have resulted in some cases because of the adjusted gross income figure being used from the tax reports versus the

Table 3.22. Comparison of reported family incomes for Des Moines' Operation Youth Opportunity^a

	Enrollees report minus Dept. of Revenue report		
	Number	% of those reporting	Cum. % of those reporting
Not available	420	-	-
-4501 +	7	15.6	15.6
-4500-2501	2	4.4	20.0
-2500-1501	8	17.8	37.8
-1500-1001	3	6.7	44.4
-1000-601	3	6.7	51.1
-600-301	3	6.7	57.7
-300-101	2	4.4	62.2
-100-+100	0	-	62.2
+101-300	0	-	62.2
+301-600	4	8.9	71.1
+601-1000	1	2.2	73.3
+1001-1500	4	8.9	82.2
+1501-2500	1	2.2	84.4
+2501-3500	5	11.1	95.5
+3501-6500	1	2.2	97.7
+6501 +	1	2.2	99.9
Total	465		

^aSource: The Iowa State Department of Revenue, Project I-TRY Questionnaire I (Appendix A) and Operation Youth Opportunity parent's confidential family income report form (Appendix C).

Enrollees report minus parents report			Parents report minus Dept. of Revenue report		
Number	% of those reporting	Cum. % of those reporting	Number	% of reports available	Cum. % of those available
303	-	-	409	-	-
1	.6	.6	10	17.9	17.9
1	.6	1.2	6	10.7	28.6
5	3.1	4.3	9	16.1	44.6
9	5.6	9.9	5	8.9	53.6
10	6.2	16.1	6	10.7	64.3
12	7.4	23.5	5	8.9	73.2
3	1.9	25.4	0	-	73.2
46	28.4	53.8	4	7.1	80.3
10	6.2	60.0	1	1.8	82.1
13	8.0	68.0	1	1.8	83.9
15	9.3	77.3	1	1.8	85.7
9	5.6	82.9	4	7.1	92.8
14	8.6	91.5	1	1.8	94.6
8	4.9	96.4	3	5.4	100.0
1	.6	97.0	0	-	100.0
5	3.1	100.1	0	-	100.0
465			465		

Table 3.23. Enrollees reported family income minus Department of Revenue reported income^a

Difference	Number	Cedar Rapids	
		% of reports available	Cum. % of reports available
Not available	167	-	-
-4501 +	4	12.1	12.1
-4500-2501	3	9.1	21.2
-2500-1501	3	9.1	30.3
-1500-1001	0	-	30.3
-1000-601	4	12.1	42.4
-600-301	3	9.1	51.5
-300-101	3	9.1	60.6
-100-+100	3	9.1	69.7
+101-300	1	3.0	72.7
+301-600	1	3.0	75.8
+601-1000	2	6.1	81.8
+1001-1500	3	9.1	90.9
+1501-2500	1	3.0	93.9
+2501-3500	1	3.0	96.9
+3501-6500	1	3.0	99.9
+6501 +	0	-	99.9
Total	200		

^aSource: The Iowa State Department of Revenue and Project I-TRY Questionnaire I (Appendix A).

Waterloo			Davenport		
Number	% of reports available	Cum. % of reports available	Number	% of reports available	Cum. % of reports available
96	-	-	52	-	-
1	6.7	6.7	0	-	-
1	6.7	13.3	2	25.0	25.0
1	6.7	20.0	1	12.5	37.5
1	6.7	26.6	2	25.0	62.5
0	-	26.6	0	-	62.5
2	13.3	40.0	0	-	62.5
2	13.3	53.3	1	12.5	75.0
0	-	53.3	0	-	75.0
2	13.3	66.6	0	-	75.0
1	6.7	73.3	0	-	75.0
0	-	73.3	1	12.5	87.5
0	-	73.3	0	-	87.5
1	6.7	80.0	0	-	87.5
2	13.3	93.3	0	-	87.5
0	-	93.3	0	-	87.5
1	6.7	99.9	1	12.5	100.0
111			60		

gross income report asked for by OYO. The gross income report includes sick pay, moving expenses, business expenses for employees, and payments of self-employed persons to retirement funds which are not included in the adjusted gross income report.

The parents were not a reliable source of family income information according to the preceding results. When whether their child got a summer job depended upon family income, the parents tended to report less income. Many parents cannot understand why their child shouldn't have the same chance to find a summer job as a youth from a low-income family down the street. These parents in many cases were willing to misrepresent their family income to gain their child a summer job.

It appears that good screening results will not be achieved from a complete reliance upon a parent's report of family income. Too many parents are willing to give a false report of family income when there appears to be no penalty for dishonesty. Programs of this type in the future will have to find ways to verify reported income figures or rely more heavily upon other criterions for screening applicants.

The enrollees also appeared to be an unreliable source of family income information. A large number of enrollees, usually about half, in each program were not aware of what their family income was or were unwilling to answer this question. Of the enrollees with income reports available in Des Moines, only 13 of 45 came within \$1,000 of the family income figure reported by the State Department of Revenue. According to Table 3.23, only 17 of 33 enrollees in Cedar Rapids came within \$1,000 of State Department of Revenue figures. In Davenport, only 2 of 8 enrollees came within \$1,000.

A program will not achieve good results in screening applicants by the

sole use of family income reported from parents or enrollees unless some method is available to verify these reports. It is unfair to penalize those people who are honest in reporting their income by denying their children jobs while admitting youths with the same family incomes whose parents are willing to misrepresent their income.

Some Suggestions for the Selection of Disadvantaged Youths for Employment Programs

The persons responsible for selection of applicants should be aware of the type of applicant the program is designed to serve. The I-TRY programs were primarily designed to serve disadvantaged youths 14-16 years of age and youths from minority groups.

The screening should be done by persons familiar with the personal and home situations of the applicants if at all possible. In this way the programs do not have to depend entirely upon unreliable income data to select the most needy applicants. Also many applicants may be more in need of an employment experience than others having smaller family incomes. The only way to evaluate these cases is by a personal knowledge of the youths involved.

If family income reports from the parents are used to screen applicants, the reliability of these reports could be checked by asking on the same forms, the employer and occupation of the parents. This might make the parents more inclined to give an honest answer concerning family income. The family income figure received could be verified by estimating their income from a knowledge of the parents' occupations and wage rates in the area.

The MIS program in Waterloo did as good a job in screening as the other

programs without family income information from the parents. They used a family income estimate, derived from the parents' occupations, plus a knowledge of each applicant to select enrollees. In this way the parents are not put in the inevitable position of denying their child a summer job by correctly reporting the family income. People who feel that their family income is confidential do not have to be asked to divulge this information.

The program should be brought to the attention of the disadvantaged through the schools and those people who work with the disadvantaged. The disadvantaged youth may be the least likely to be aggressive in seeking out employment. He may also be the least likely to be aware of possibilities that exist for summer employment. The programs will not reach the needy youths unless there is a vigorous outreach system to bring these youths into the pool of applicants.

Some of the I-TRY programs relied almost entirely upon the schools to provide applicants for their programs. Many disadvantaged youth no longer enrolled in the schools may have been missed. These youths may have been most in need of employment experience. There is also a possibility that many of these dropouts could have been encouraged to return to school through the counseling services in these employment programs. A greater effort could be made to reach out-of-school youth.

Instead of setting up only a family income-family size guideline, the program could set up a multi-faceted guideline to include all the variables they feel are important in indicating the youths most in need of their program. The variables might include family income, family size, race, sex, family stability, mental stability of the applicant, behavioral problems, future expectations, achievement potential, social grace, etc. Under this

guideline, several combinations of these variables could admit a youth to the program. If more information is gathered about the applicants before the program, there would also be a greater opportunity to place an enrollee into employment best fitting his situation.

CHAPTER IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

At the urging of Governor Harold E. Hughes of Iowa, private business and industry plus interested citizens organized and funded youth-work programs in many Iowa cities during the summers of 1967 and 1968. Over 1,100 youths were provided employment by these programs in the summer of 1968. Most of the jobs were in the non-profit sector of the community with the wages being paid by a non-profit community corporation, funded and organized by the private sector of the community.

The U.S. Department of Labor through the Iowa Manpower Development Council provided \$1 for ancillary and supportive services for every \$4 the private sector raised to pay wages and administrative costs. Cedar Rapids, Davenport, Des Moines, and Waterloo took advantage of the matching funds for ancillary and supportive services.

Funds were also provided to the Industrial Relations Center of Iowa State University to conduct an evaluation of the youth employment programs receiving Project I-TRY (Iowa Training and Retraining of Youth) funds. This study is a part of that evaluation.

All of the I-TRY programs had as a goal the provision of a meaningful work experience for disadvantaged youth in their community. This study assesses the effectiveness of the programs in reaching and selecting disadvantaged youths. The personal and family characteristics of all the enrollees were examined, the family incomes as reported by the Iowa State Department of Revenue were compared with the family income-family size guidelines for the various programs, and the personal and family characteristics of those enrollees over the family income guidelines were studied.

A large portion of the enrollees in Project I-TRY were disadvantaged youths. This was indicated by the numbers of youths from families¹ receiving welfare payments, the 40 percent of enrollees coming from households with over six members, the 41.5 percent of enrollees from families with at least one parent missing, the 46 percent of enrollees who were non-white, the numbers of enrollees who had past problems with law authorities, and the enrollees not planning to continue their schooling.

A large number of enrollees in each program were not economically disadvantaged according to the family income-family size guidelines. An estimated 25-50 percent of the enrollees exceeded the family income guidelines according to family income information from the Iowa State Department of Revenue.

Of those exceeding the family income guidelines, a number were admitted to the I-TRY programs because of special circumstances (e.g. personal problems, mental problems, family problems, discipline problems, etc.). The programs felt they should be flexible in their admission criterions to help the youths with the most need for an employment experience regardless of family income. A number of those enrollees exceeding the family income guideline could be considered disadvantaged on the basis of family size, race, low social class, and other criterions. Family income by itself may not give an adequate picture of those youths with the most need.

The I-TRY programs admitted a much larger percentage of non-whites applicants than the percentage of non-white population in the various communities. This reflects a greater need by non-white youth for employment and a desire by the programs to reduce racial tensions in their cities.

The parents of the applicants to Operation Youth Opportunity (OYO) in

Des Moines were an unreliable source of income information according to comparisons of their income reports with the Iowa State Department of Revenue reports. Many parents were unwilling to state their correct family income realizing this would deny their son or daughter a summer job in OYO.

The best way to get the needy to apply is to use a vigorous outreach system to acquaint the disadvantaged with the opportunities for employment. The best way to select the most needy of the applicants for a youth employment program is to have a screening committee which is familiar with the applicants and their families.

The four I-TRY programs were successful in providing an employment experience for 1,100 youths. A majority were disadvantaged youths when compared with the rest of the community according to criteria examined in this study. These programs plus other public and private youth employment programs were inadequate in that many youths in the cities with I-TRY programs and over 1.6 million youths in the United States were unemployed during the summer of 1968 (58, No. 3, p. 5).

LITERATURE CITED

1. Batchelder, Alan B. The economics of poverty. New York, N.Y., John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1966.
2. Bergstrom, Howard E. Job performance of young workers in relation to school background. Minneapolis, Minn., Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, Inc. 1966.
3. Bogan, Forrest A. Employment of school age youth, October 1965. U.S. Department of Labor Special Labor Force Report No. 68. 1966.
4. Carr, Lowell J. Delinquency control. New York, N.Y., Harper and Brothers, Inc. 1940.
5. Chernick, Jack; Indik, Bernard P.; and Craig, Roger. The selection of trainees under MDTA. New Brunswick, N.J., Institute of Management and Labor Relations, Rutgers University. ca. 1966.
6. Citizens Study Committee, Davenport, Iowa. A study of human needs and community services of Scott County, Iowa: poverty study. Davenport, Iowa, Author. 1968.
7. Citizens Study Committee, Davenport, Iowa. A study of human needs and community services of Scott County, Iowa: summary. Davenport, Iowa, Author. 1968.
8. Community Improvement, Inc. Annual report. Des Moines, Iowa, Author. March 1969.
9. Community Improvement, Inc. Operation Youth Opportunity, summer-1968: a final report and evaluation. Des Moines, Iowa, Author. 1968.
10. Council of State Governments, President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Juvenile delinquency: a report on state action and responsibilities. Chicago, Illinois, Author. 1962.
11. Crusade for Opportunity in Syracuse and Onodaga County, Inc. Final mimeographed report. Washington, D.C., Division of Special Programs, Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, U.S. Department of Labor. 1964.
12. The Des Moines Police Department Juvenile Bureau. Annual report for 1968. Mimeo. Des Moines, Iowa, Author. 1969.
13. Duff, Raymond S. and Hollingshead, August B. Sickness and society. New York, N.Y., Harper and Row, Inc. 1968.

14. Eckerman, William C.; Gerstel, Eva K.; and Williams, Richard B. A comprehensive assessment of the problems and characteristics of the Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees: a pilot investigation. Durham, N.C., Research Triangle Institute. 1969.
15. Fillmore, William S., Jr. Experimental and demonstration residential project of St. Petersburg, (Pinellas) Florida: final report. Mimeo. St. Petersburg, Florida, Author. September 1965.
16. Flanagan, John C. Project talent: the American high school student. Pittsburgh, Project Talent Office, University of Pittsburgh. 1964.
17. Floyd Hunter Co. A training program for out-of-school youth. Final mimeographed report of MDTA experimental and demonstration project. Berkeley, California, Floyd Hunter Company. November 1965.
18. Glazer, Nona Y. and Creedon, Carol F. Children and poverty: some sociological and psychological perspectives. Chicago, Ill., Rand McNally and Company. 1968.
19. Glueck, Sheldon. The problem of delinquency. Boston, Mass., Houghton Mifflin Company. 1959.
20. Hathaway, Starke R. and Monachesi, Elio D. Analyzing and predicting juvenile delinquency with the MMPI. Minneapolis, Minn., University of Minnesota Press. 1953.
21. Herman, Melvin and Sadofsky, Stanley. Youth-work programs: problems of planning and operation. New York, Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, Graduate School of Social Work, New York University. 1966.
22. Hirschi, Travis and Selvin, Hanan C. Delinquency research: an appraisal of analytical methods. New York, N.Y., The Free Press. 1967.
23. Hollingshead, August B. and Redlich, Frederick C. Social class and mental illness. New York, N.Y., John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1958.
24. Industrial Relations Center, Iowa State University. First interim report on research/evaluation component of I-TRY. Ames, Iowa, Author. July 1968.
25. Industrial Relations Center, Iowa State University. Second interim report on research/evaluation component of I-TRY. Ames, Iowa, Author. October 1968.
26. Industrial Relations Center, Iowa State University. Third interim report on research/evaluation component of I-TRY. Ames, Iowa, Author. February 1969.

27. Iowa, State of. Department of Public Instruction. Dropouts: Iowa public schools July 2, 1963--June 30, 1964. Des Moines, Iowa, The State of Iowa. 1965.
28. Lunden, Walter A. Crime and delinquency in Des Moines and Polk County, Iowa 1956 - 1965. (Prepared for Des Moines Police Department and the Polk County Sheriff Staff). Ames, Iowa, Department of Economics and Sociology, Iowa State University. May 1966.
29. Miles, Guy H. Final report on phase I - optimizing the benefits of Neighborhood Youth Corps Projects for rural youths. Minneapolis, Minn., North Star Research and Development Institute. ca. 1967.
30. Miles, Guy H. Report on survey of recent literature relevant to optimizing the benefits of Neighborhood Youth Corps Projects for rural youth. Minneapolis, Minn., North Star Research and Development. ca. 1967.
31. Miller, Delbert C. Handbook of research design and social measurement. New York, David McKay Co., Inc. 1964.
32. Myers, Jerome K. and Bean, Lee L. A decade later: a follow-up social class and mental illness. New York, N.Y., John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1968.
33. The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Report. The New York Times Editor. New York, N.Y., Bantam Books, Inc. 1968.
34. The National Committee on Employment of Youth. Summer jobs for youth - 1968: survey of twenty major cities. New York, N.Y., Author. 1968.
35. National Institute of Labor Education. Final report to the Secretary of Labor, U.S. Labor Department on OMAT Project P 3-63. Washington, D.C., Author. July 1965.
36. Nosow, Sigmund. Retraining under the Manpower Development Training Act: a study of attributes of trainees associated with successful retraining. Lansing, Mich., School of Labor and Industrial Relations, Michigan State University. January 1965.
37. Palomba, Neil A. Evaluation of Iowa Governor's dropout program. Des Moines, Iowa, Iowa Manpower Development Council. ca. 1968.
38. Papaioannou, P. C. and Soultis, D. J. ELAFOS reference manual. Iowa State University, Statistical Laboratory, Numerical Analysis-Programming Series, No. 10. August 1967.
39. Perrella, Vera C. Employment of school age youth, October 1966. U.S. Department of Labor, Special Labor Force Report 87. 1967.

40. Peterson, Gertrude D. An evaluation of the concept of trainee camps for unemployed youth. Stanford, Calif., Stanford Research Institute. June 1965.
41. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. The challenge of crime in a free society. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office. 1967.
42. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Task force report: juvenile delinquency and youth crime. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office. 1967.
43. The President's Committee on Youth Employment. The challenge of jobless youth. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office. April 1963.
44. Radomski, Alexander L. and Mills, Anita U. Family income and related characteristics among low-income counties and states. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Welfare Research Report I. 1964.
45. Robin, Gerald D. An assessment of the In-Public School Neighborhood Youth Corps Projects in Cincinnati and Detroit, with special reference to summer only and year-round enrollees. Philadelphia, Pa., National Analysts, Inc. 1969.
46. Robison, Sophia Moses. Can delinquency be measured? New York, N.Y., Columbia Free Press. 1936.
47. Ross, Arthur M. and Hill, Herbert. Employment, race and poverty. New York, N.Y., Harcourt, Brace and World. 1967.
48. Smith, Arthur E.; Collins, Hardin A.; and Meindl, Joseph L. Evaluation and skill training of out-of-school, hard core unemployed youth for training and placement. Saint Louis, Mo., Department of Education, Saint Louis University. 1964-1965.
49. Socknat, James A. Governor Harold E. Hughes and social crisis in Iowa: a study of the exercise of gubernatorial power for human resource development. Ames, Iowa, Industrial Relations Center, Iowa State University. January 1969.
50. U.S. Census Bureau. 18th Census, 1960. Population, 1, Part 17A. 1960.
51. U.S. Census Bureau. 18th Census, 1960. Population, 1, Part 17B. 1960.
52. U.S. Census Bureau. 18th Census, 1960. Population, 1, Part 17C. 1960.
53. U.S. Census Bureau. Special Census of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, March 29, 1966. Series P-28, No. 1402. 1966.

54. U.S. Census Bureau. Special Census of Davenport, Iowa, October 7, 1966. Series P-28, No. 1440. 1966.
55. U.S. Census Bureau. Special Census of Des Moines, Iowa, April 28, 1966. Series P-28, No. 1430. 1966.
56. U.S. Census Bureau. Special Census of Waterloo, Iowa, April 28, 1966. Series P-28, No. 1436. 1966.
57. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Monthly Report 14, No. 10-12. April-June 1968.
58. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Monthly Report 15, No. 1-3. July-September 1968.
59. U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration. Detroit riot: a profile of 500 prisoners. Washington, D.C., Author. March 1968.
60. U.S. Department of Labor. Manpower report of the President. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing. 1968.
61. U.S. Department of Labor. Oak Glenn-a training camp for unemployed youth. U.S. Department of Labor Manpower Automation Research Monograph No. 5. 1966.
62. U.S. Department of Labor. Young workers: their special training needs. U.S. Department of Labor Manpower Research Bulletin No. 3. May 1963.
63. Waterloo Community Schools. Summary of questionnaires given to Waterloo 1968 Summer Program students. Unpublished report on Waterloo's Metropolitan Improvement Services 1968 Summer employment program. Waterloo, Iowa, Author. November 1968.
64. Wather, Regis H. and Magnusson, Margaret. A retrospective study of the effectiveness of out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps Programs in four urban sites. Washington, D.C., Social Research Group, George Washington University. November 1967.
65. Will, Robert E. and Vatter, Harold G. Poverty in affluence. New York, N.Y., Harcourt, Brace and World. 1965.
66. YMCA Vocational Service Center Project. Final Report of the YMCA Youth and Work Project 1962-1966. Brooklyn, N.Y., Author. April 1966.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation to Dr. Edward B. Jakubauskas and Dr. Neil A. Palomba for their assistance with the research that has gone into this study. Appreciation is extended to Dr. Richard D. Warren for serving on the author's graduate committee.

This study would not have been possible without the cooperation of the administrative personnel in the four Project I-TRY programs. The author hopes the information presented in this study may be utilized in the implementation of these and other youth-work programs.

Appreciation is also extended to the Iowa State Department of Revenue; the Iowa State Department of Social Services; the public schools in Waterloo, Davenport, Cedar Rapids and Des Moines; the Des Moines Police Department Juvenile Bureau; the juvenile probation offices in Waterloo and Cedar Rapids; and the Iowa State Employment Service in the four cities with I-TRY programs for their assistance in the collection of data for this study.

Funds were made available for this study by the Iowa Manpower Development Council through a grant from the United States Department of Labor Manpower Administration.

APPENDIX A

PROJECT I-TRY

Confidential Questionnaire I

- (1) Name _____ (2) Soc. Sec. No. _____
- (3) Address _____
- (4) Age _____ (5) Race _____ (6) Sex: Male _____ Female _____
- (7) Education (Number of years completed) _____
- (8) Will you be in school next fall? Yes _____ No _____ (If No, briefly explain why not _____)
- (9) If you dropped out of school, did you receive a letter from the Governor? Yes _____
No _____ If yes, what did you do because of this letter? _____

- (10) What amount and type of in-school and/or correspondence school education do you expect to receive in your lifetime? _____

- (11) What amount and type of skill-training do you expect to receive in your lifetime? _____

- (12) What type of occupation do you expect to work at in the future? _____

- (13) Number of people living in your household? _____
- (14) a. Is your father: Deceased _____ Living at home _____
Not living at home _____
- b. Is your mother: Deceased _____ Living at home _____
Not living at home _____

(15) Number of people with a job in your family?

<u>Relationship</u> (father, mother, brother, etc.)	<u>Age</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

(16) Number of people without a job and looking for one in your family:

<u>Relationship</u> (father, mother, brother, etc.)	<u>Age</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

(17) Head of your family: Male _____ Female _____

(18) Years of education of family head? _____

(19) Approximate family income: \$ _____ per year

(20) Past work and training experience:

a. Work (Please list all your past jobs)

<u>Job</u>	<u>Wage</u>	<u>Period of employment</u>	<u>Reason for leaving</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

b. Training (Please list past training programs and manpower programs, such as Neighborhood Youth Corps and Job Corps, you were enrolled in.)

<u>Program</u>	<u>Length of time enrolled</u>	<u>Reason for leaving</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

- (21) Please list past problems with school authorities (such as suspension or expulsion) or law authorities (such as arrest), including the final outcome of the incident.

- (22) Have you ever looked for a job? Yes _____ No _____ If yes, what did you do? Go to the Employment Security Office _____

Check want ads _____

Speak to friends or relatives _____

Other (please list) _____

PROJECT I-TRY

Confidential Questionnaire II

(1) Name _____ (2) Soc. Sec. # _____

(3) Address _____

(4) Are you in school now? Yes _____ No _____

FUTURE PLANS

(5) Education

(a) Do you plan to complete high school?

Yes _____
No _____
Uncertain _____

(b) Do you plan to take or are you taking vocational courses (secretarial, shop, auto mechanics, agriculture, etc.) during high school to prepare you for a future occupation?

Yes _____
No _____
Uncertain _____

What type of courses? _____

(c) Do you plan to go to a four year college?

Yes _____
No _____
Uncertain _____

If known -- what college? _____

(d) Do you plan to go to a (two-year) junior college?

Yes _____
No _____
Uncertain _____

If known -- what college? _____

(e) Do you plan to take technical (trade), medical service or business school training?

Yes _____
 No _____
 Uncertain _____

If yes what type? _____

If known what school? _____

(f) Do you plan any other type of training not listed above?

Yes _____
 No _____
 Uncertain _____

If yes what kind of training? On-the-Job Training _____ Military _____

Apprenticeship _____ Other _____

(6) Job

What type of occupation do you expect to work at in the future? _____

(7) While you were involved with New Horizons did you have any problems with school authorities or law authorities?

Yes _____
 No _____

If yes explain _____

(8) If you had not been associated with New Horizons would you have

- (a) earned more money _____
- (b) earned the same amount _____
- (c) earned less money _____
- (d) had no job _____

(9) How did you spend the money you earned from **New Horizons?**

	<u>SPENT NONE ON</u>	<u>SPENT VERY LITTLE ON</u>	<u>SPENT SOME ON</u>	<u>SPENT MOST ON</u>
(a) entertainment (movies, dances, bowling, etc.)	_____	_____	_____	_____
(b) personal items (clothes, etc.)	_____	_____	_____	_____
(c) school expenses (books, supplies)	_____	_____	_____	_____
(d) savings	_____	_____	_____	_____
(e) transportation (car, bus fares)	_____	_____	_____	_____
(f) family support (rent, food, etc.)	_____	_____	_____	_____
(g) other _____ (Please specify)	_____	_____	_____	_____

(10) Did you receive help or advice in the past year concerning the following problems or decisions?

	<u>NOT NEEDED</u>	<u>NEEDED BUT NOT RECEIVED</u>	<u>RECEIVED BUT NOT HELPFUL</u>	<u>RECEIVED SOMEWHAT HELPFUL</u>	<u>RECEIVED VERY HELPFUL</u>
(a) personal	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(b) family	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(c) job	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(d) financial	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(e) law	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(f) other _____ Please specify	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

(11) Have you received any help or advice in the past year from:

	<u>HELP NOT NEEDED</u>	<u>HELP NEEDED BUT NOT RECEIVED</u>	<u>RECEIVED VERY LITTLE</u>	<u>RECEIVED SOME</u>	<u>RECEIVED MUCH</u>
(a) school counselors	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(b) the employment service	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(c) New Horizons counselors	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(d) New Horizons supervisors	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(e) New Horizons fellow workers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(f) parent	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(g) teachers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(h) friends or relatives	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(i) minister, priest, rabbi	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

(12) Please evaluate the New Horizons Program.

	<u>NO OPINION</u>	<u>DID NOT LIKE</u>	<u>LIKED LITTLE</u>	<u>LIKED SOME</u>	<u>LIKED MUCH</u>
(a) type of job	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(b) job supervisor	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(c) job pay	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(d) hours of work available	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(e) counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(f) educational activities	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(g) fellow workers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(h) other _____ (Please specify)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

(13) Would you recommend Program to a younger brother, sister or to friend?

YES _____ NO _____ Maybe _____

PROJECT I-TRY

Confidential Questionnaire III

- (1) Name _____ (2) Soc. Sec. # _____
- (3) Address _____
- (4) Are you in school now? Yes _____ No _____

FUTURE PLANS

(5) Education

(a) Do you plan to complete high school?

Yes _____
No _____
Uncertain _____

(b) Do you plan ~~to take~~ or are you taking vocational courses (secretarial, shop, auto mechanics, agriculture, etc.) during high school to prepare you for a future occupation?

Yes _____
No _____
Uncertain _____

What type of ~~courses~~? _____

(c) Do you plan to go to a four year college?

Yes _____
No _____
Uncertain _____

If known -- what college? _____

(d) Do you plan to go to a (two-year) junior college?

Yes _____
No _____
Uncertain _____

If known -- what college? _____

(e) Do you plan to take technical (trade), medical service or business school training?

Yes _____
No _____
Uncertain _____

If yes what type? _____

If known what school? _____

(f) Do you plan any other type of training not listed above?

Yes _____
No _____
Uncertain _____

If yes what kind of training? On-the-Job Training _____ Military _____

Apprenticeship _____ Other _____

(6) Job

What type of occupation do you expect to work at in the future? _____

(7) While you were involved with O.Y.O. did you have any problems with school authorities or law authorities?

Yes _____
No _____

If yes explain _____

(8) If you had not been associated with O.Y.O. would you have

(a) earned more money _____

(b) earned the same amount _____

(c) earned less money _____

(d) had no job _____

(9) How did you spend the money you earned from **Operation Youth Opportunity?**

	<u>SPENT NONE ON</u>	<u>SPENT VERY LITTLE ON</u>	<u>SPENT SOME ON</u>	<u>SPENT MOST ON</u>
(a) entertainment (movies, dances, bowling, etc.)	_____	_____	_____	_____
(b) personal items (clothes, etc.)	_____	_____	_____	_____
(c) school expenses (books, supplies)	_____	_____	_____	_____
(d) savings	_____	_____	_____	_____
(e) transportation (car, bus fares)	_____	_____	_____	_____
(f) family support (rent, food, etc.)	_____	_____	_____	_____
(g) other _____ (Please specify)	_____	_____	_____	_____

(10) Did you receive help or advice in the past year concerning the following problems or decisions?

	<u>NOT NEEDED</u>	<u>NEEDED BUT NOT RECEIVED</u>	<u>RECEIVED BUT NOT HELPFUL</u>	<u>RECEIVED SOMEWHAT HELPFUL</u>	<u>RECEIVED VERY HELPFUL</u>
(a) personal	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(b) family	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(c) job	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(d) financial	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(e) law	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(f) other _____ Please specify	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

(11) Have you received any help or advice in the past year from:

	<u>HELP NOT NEEDED</u>	<u>HELP NEEDED BUT NOT RECEIVED</u>	<u>RECEIVED VERY LITTLE</u>	<u>RECEIVED SOME</u>	<u>RECEIVED MUCH</u>
(a) school counselors	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(b) the employment service	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(c) O.Y.O. counselors	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(d) O.Y.O. supervisors	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(e) O.Y.O. fellow workers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(f) parent	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(g) teachers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(h) friends or relatives	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(i) minister, priest, rabbi	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

(12) Please evaluate the O.Y.O. Program.

	<u>NO OPINION</u>	<u>DID NOT LIKE</u>	<u>LIKED LITTLE</u>	<u>LIKED SOME</u>	<u>LIKED MUCH</u>
(a) type of job	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(b) job supervisor	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(c) job pay	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(d) hours of work available	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(e) counseling	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(f) educational activities	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(g) fellow workers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(h) other _____ (Please specify)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

(13) Would you recommend Program to a younger brother, sister or to a friend?

YES _____ NO _____ Maybe _____

- 5 -

14) Why did you terminate your connection with _____?

15) Did you receive another job? Yes _____ No _____

If yes was it: better _____

worse _____

same _____

PROJECT I-TRY

Confidential Questionnaire IV

(1) Name _____ (2) Soc. Sec. # _____

(3) Address _____

(4) Are you in school now? Yes _____ No _____

Future Plans

(5) Education

(a) Do you plan to complete high school?

Yes _____
No _____
Uncertain _____

(b) Do you plan to take or are you taking vocational courses (secretarial, shop, auto mechanics, agriculture, etc.) during high school to prepare you for a future occupation?

Yes _____
No _____
Uncertain _____

What type of courses? _____

(c) Do you plan to go to a four year college?

Yes _____
No _____
Uncertain _____

If known -- what college? _____

(d) Do you plan to go to a (two-year) junior college?

Yes _____
No _____
Uncertain _____

If known -- what college? _____

(e) Do you plan to take technical (trade), medical service or business school training?

Yes _____
No _____
Uncertain _____

If yes what type? _____

If known what school? _____

(f) Do you plan any other type of training not listed above?

Yes _____
No _____
Uncertain _____

If yes what kind of training? On-the-Job Training _____ Military _____

Apprenticeship _____ Other _____

(6) Job

What type of occupation do you expect to work at in the future? _____

(7) Did you have any problems with school or law authorities during the past summer and this school year?

Yes _____
No _____

If yes explain _____

(8) Did you have a job this past summer? Yes _____ No _____. If yes, what was it and what was your wage & hours worked?

Job _____
Wage _____
Hours _____

(9) How did you locate this job? _____

- 3 -

- (10) How did you spend the money you earned
(Check the spaces you believe fit your case)

	<u>SPENT NONE ON</u>	<u>SPENT VERY LITTLE ON</u>	<u>SPENT SOME ON</u>	<u>SPENT MOST ON</u>
(a) entertainment (movies, dances, bowling, etc.)	—	—	—	—
(b) personal items (clothes, etc.)	—	—	—	—
(c) school expenses (books, supplies)	—	—	—	—
(d) savings	—	—	—	—
(e) transportation (car, bus fares)	—	—	—	—
(f) family support (rent, food, etc.)	—	—	—	—
(g) other _____ Please Specify	—	—	—	—

- (11) Did you receive help or advice in the past year concerning the following
problems or decisions?

	<u>NOT NEEDED</u>	<u>NEEDED BUT NOT RECEIVED</u>	<u>RECEIVED BUT NOT HELPFUL</u>	<u>RECEIVED SOMEWHAT HELPFUL</u>	<u>RECEIVED VERY HELPFUL</u>
(a) personal	—	—	—	—	—
(b) family	—	—	—	—	—
(c) job	—	—	—	—	—
(d) financial	—	—	—	—	—
(e) law	—	—	—	—	—
(f) other _____ Please Specify	—	—	—	—	—

(12) Have you received any help or advice in the past year from:

	<u>HELP NOT NEEDED</u>	<u>HELP NEEDED BUT NOT RECEIVED</u>	<u>RECEIVED VERY LITTLE</u>	<u>RECEIVED SOME</u>	<u>RECEIVED MUCH</u>
(a) school counselors	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(b) the employment service	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(c) parent	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(d) teachers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(e) friends or relatives	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(f) minister, priest, rabbi	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

(13) If you heard about MIS please give us your opinion (or state briefly what you heard about the program).

(14) Would you be interested in participating in the MIS Program or a similar one? Yes _____ No _____

1. Name and address and telephone number of Corporation: _____

2. List of Directors of Corporation and business titles: (obtain and attach list)
3. Officers of Corporation: (officers listed in corporate charter: e.g. Pres., Secy., etc.) (obtain and attach list)
4. Date of incorporation:
5. Title of predecessor organization, if any, to community corporation:
6. Amount of Funds for 1968 I-TRY:
 - (a) target _____ as of _____
date
 - (1) cash:
 - (2) in-kind:
 - (3) other (explain):
 - (b) Raised to date _____:
date
 - (1) cash
 - (2) in-kind
 - (3) other (explain):
 - (c) Final amount raised (to be answered about April 1969):
 - (1) cash
 - (2) in-kind
 - (3) other (explain):
7. List of Contributors to corporation and amounts: (specify amount; whether from individual or a firm; whether cash or in-kind--describe in-kind contributions)

8. Describe how funds were raised: i.e. number of meetings held and number and types of persons attending - both
 - (a) potential contributors, and
 - (b) fund raisers - e.g. Governor, Mayor, leading businessman or citizen, etc.
9. Evaluation of interviewee (Corp. spokesman) as to most effective techniques employed, what to do, what to avoid, etc. if replicated. N.B. ask question "What importance does Governor's role play, if any, in raising funds and launching program."
10. * Narrative of structure (explain differences between formal arrangements and actual de facto workings.) Include names of agencies that will provide:
 - (a) outreach
 - (b) referral to screening agency(ies)
 - (c) screening for placement, including youth and job matching
11. Describe "job development" process - with whom or what agencies corp. worked in developing jobs. Explain background and reasons if both public and private sector job slots are involved.
12. List of jobs developed in public sector (and available in private sector if applicable) - job title and brief description and name of employer.
13. ** What ancillary services anticipated to be offered: (specify services to be offered and how such services will be offered - i.e. what agencies, organizations, or individuals expected to offer services)
14. General narrative of expectations of corp. spokesman of I-TRY - what it will do; what it should do that it can't; short and long-run need for such programs by private community corp.; (in-general-the corporation expectations of the program and role it plays in general scheme of things.)

- * Question #10 should be supplemented with follow-up information from agencies on:
- (a) techniques of outreach used - media publicity, agency professional outreach markers, mobile buses, etc.
 - (b) criteria used by referring agencies in decisions on screening-out and screening-in
 - (c) tools used in screening, placement and matching - which tests, interviews, etc.

** Corp. interviews should be held again at end of summer and near end of program to bring out what shifts if any occurred in ancillary service offerings and reasons for changes in services (e.g. need, availability, etc.)

APPENDIX B

Table B.1. Age distribution of participants in Project I-TRY

		Age								Total	Average
		13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20		
DAVENPORT Play Corps											
Participants CPI											
Number		1	11	12	4	2	0	0	0	30	
%		3.3	36.7	40.0	13.3	6.7	0	0	0	100	14.83
Participants NYC											
Number		0	6	5	10	4	1	0	0	26	
%		0	23.1	19.2	38.5	15.4	3.8	0	0	100	15.58
Terminated Employment											
Number		0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	
%		0	25.0	25.0	50.0	0	0	0	0	100	15.25
CEDAR RAPIDS Youth Employment Service											
Participants											
Number		2	62	61	40	20	8	2	2	197	
%		1.0	31.5	31.0	20.3	10.2	4.6	1.0	1.0	100	15.29
Terminated Employment											
Number		0	8	6	8	3	1	0	0	26	
%		0	30.8	23.1	30.8	11.5	3.8	0	0	100	15.35
Total Entering Program											
Number		2	70	67	48	23	9	2	2	223	
%		0.9	31.4	30.0	21.5	10.3	4.0	0.9	0.9	100	15.31
DES MOINES Operation Youth Opportunity											
Participants											
Number		1	95	129	101	75	21	5	2	429	
%		0.2	22.1	30.1	23.5	17.5	4.9	1.2	0.5	100	15.59

Table B.1. (Continued)

	Age								Total	Average
	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20		
Terminated Employment										
Number	0	7	6	12	3	3	0	0	31	
%	0.0	22.6	19.3	38.7	9.7	9.7	0	0	100	14.70
Total Entering Program										
Number	1	102	135	113	78	24	5	2	460	
%	0.2	22.2	29.3	24.6	17.0	5.2	1.1	0.4	100	15.58
WATERLOO Metropolitan Improvement Services										
Participants										
Number	0	50	41	7	0	0	0	0	98	
%	0.0	51.0	41.8	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100	14.56
Terminated Employment										
Number	1	6	4	1	1	0	0	0	13	
%	7.7	46.2	30.8	7.7	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100	14.69
Total Entering Program										
Number	1	56	45	8	1	0	0	0	111	
%	0.9	50.5	40.5	7.2	0.9	-	-	-	100	14.35
All I-TRY										
Participants										
Number	5	245	261	183	108	34	7	4	847	
%	.59	29.1	30.81	21.61	12.75	4.01	.83	.47	100	

Table B.2. Sex of I-TRY participants

		Sex		Total
		Male	Female	
DAVENPORT Play Corps				
Participants CPI				
Number		18	12	30
%		60.0	40.0	100
Participants NYC				
Number		10	16	26
%		38.5	61.5	100
Terminated Employment				
Number		3	1	4
%		75.0	25.0	100
CEDAR RAPIDS Youth Employment Services				
Participants				
Number		116	83	199
%		58.3	41.7	100
Terminated Employment				
Number		19	7	26
%		73.1	26.9	100
Total Entering Program				
Number		135	90	225
%		60.0	40.0	100
DES MOINES Operation Youth Opportunity				
Participants				
Number		247	184	431
%		57.4	42.6	100
Terminated Employment				
Number		19	14	33
%		57.6	42.4	100
Total Entering Program				
Number		266	198	464
%		57.2	42.8	100
WATERLOO Metropolitan Improvement Service				
Participants				
Number		90	8	98
%		91.8	8.2	100

Table B.2. (Continued)

	Sex		Total
	Male	Female	
Terminated Employment			
Number	12	1	13
%	92.3	7.7	100
Total Entering Program			
Number	102	9	111
%	91.9	8.1	100
All I-TRY			
Participants			
Number	531	325	856
%	62.03	37.97	100

Table B.3. Race of I-TRY participants

		Race				
		Caucasian	Negro	Spanish American	No response	Total
DAVENPORT Play Corps						
Participants CPI						
Number		14	12	2	2	30
%		50.0	42.9	7.1	-	100
Participants NYC						
Number		15	10	1	0	26
%		57.7	38.5	3.8	0	100
Terminated Employment						
Number		3	1	0	0	4
%		75.0	25.0	0	0	100
CEDAR RAPIDS Youth Employment Services						
Participants						
Number		116	43	1	40	200
%		72.5	26.9	0.6	0	100
Terminated Employment						
Number		20	4	0	2	26
%		83.3	16.7	0	0	100
Total Entering Program						
Number		136	47	1	42	226
%		73.9	25.5	0.6	0	100
DES MOINES Operation Youth Opportunity						
Participants						
Number		192	221	6	13	432
%		45.8	52.8	1.4	0	100

Table B.3. (Continued)

	Race			No response	Total
	Caucasian	Negro	Spanish American		
Terminated Employment					
Number	19	12	0	2	33
%	61.3	38.7	0	-	100
Total Entering Program					
Number	211	233	6	15	465
%	46.9	51.8	1.3	-	100
WATERLOO Metropolitan Improvement Services					
Participants					
Number	48	43	1	6	98
%	52.2	46.7	1.1	0	100
Terminated Employment					
Number	4	9	0	0	13
%	30.8	69.2	0	0	100
Total Entering Program					
Number	52	52	1	6	111
%	49.5	49.5	1.0	0	100
All I-TRY					
Participants					
Number	427	354	11	65	858
%	53.9	44.6	1.4		100

Table B.4. Educational level of I-TRY participants

	Number				
	6	7	8	9	10
DAVENPORT Play Corps					
Participants CPI					
Number	1	2	11	10	4
%	3.3	6.7	36.7	33.3	13.3
Participants NYC					
Number	0	3	8	4	6
%	0	11.5	30.8	15.4	23.1
Terminated Employment					
Number	0	0	1	1	2
%	0	0	25.0	25.0	50.0
CEDAR RAPIDS Youth Employment Services					
Participants					
Number	2	17	46	61	45
%	1.1	8.9	24.2	32.1	23.7
Terminated Employment					
Number	0	1	6	6	8
%	0	4.0	24.0	24.0	32.0
Total Entering Program					
Number	2	18	52	67	53
%	0.9	8.4	24.2	31.2	24.7
DES MOINES Operation Youth Opportunity					
Participants					
Number	5	13	88	114	100
%	1.2	3.1	21.3	27.5	24.2
Terminated Employment					
Number	0	6	5	5	9
%	0	18.8	15.6	15.6	28.1
Total Entering Program					
Number	5	19	93	119	109
%	1.1	4.3	20.9	26.7	24.4
WATERLOO Metropolitan Improvement Services					
Participants					
Number	0	10	46	34	7
%	0	10.3	47.4	35.1	7.2

years				No response	Total	Average
11	12	13	14			
1	1	0	0	0	30	
3.3	3.3	0	0	0	100	8.7
3	2	0	0	0	26	
11.5	7.7	0	0	0	100	9.15
0	0	0	0	0	4	
0	0	0	0	0	100	9.25
13	5	1	0	10	200	
6.8	2.6	0.5	0	-	100	9.02
4	0	0	0	1	26	
16.0	0	0	0	-	100	9.32
17	5	1	0	11	226	
7.9	2.3	0.5	0	-	100	9.06
74	17	2	1	18	432	
17.9	4.1	0.5	0.2	0	100	9.43
4	3	0	0	1	33	
12.5	9.4	0	0	0	100	9.00
78	20	2	1	19	465	
17.5	4.5	0.5	0.2	0	100	9.43
0	0	0	0	1	98	
0	0	0	0	0	100	8.39

Table B.4. (Continued)

	Number				
	6	7	8	9	10
Terminated Employment					
Number	0	1	6	3	1
%	0	8.3	50.0	25.0	8.3
Total Entering Program					
Number	0	11	52	37	8
%	0	10.1	47.7	33.9	7.3
All I-TRY					
Participants					
Number	8	53	216	237	180
%	1.0	6.42	26.2	28.7	21.8

years				No response	Total	Average
11	12	13	14			
0	1	0	0	1	13	
0	8.3	0	0	0	100	8.66
0	1	0	0	2	111	
0	0.9	0	0	0	100	8.42
99	29	3	1	32	858	
12.0	3.5	.4	.1	-	100	9.2

Table B.5. School status

	Returning to school	Not returning to school	No response	Total
DAVENPORT				
Participants CPI				
Number	29	0	1	30
%	100.0	0	-	100
Participants NYC				
Number	24	1	1	26
%	96.0	4.0	-	100
Terminated Employment				
Number	4	0	0	4
%	100.0	0	0	100
CEDAR RAPIDS Youth Employment Services				
Participants				
Number	178	11	11	200
%	94.2	5.8	-	100
Terminated Employment				
Number	26	0	0	26
%	100.0	0	0	100
Total Entering Program				
Number	204	11	11	226
%	94.9	5.1	-	100
DES MOINES Operation Youth Opportunity				
Participants				
Number	395	20	17	432
%	95.2	4.8	-	100
Terminated Employment				
Number	28	4	1	33
%	87.5	12.5	-	100
Total Entering Program				
Number	423	24	18	465
%	91.0	9.0	-	100
WATERLOO Metropolitan Improvement Services				
Participants				
Number	94	2	2	98
%	97.9	2.1	-	100

Table B.5. (Continued)

	Returning to school	Not returning to school	No response	Total
Terminated Employment				
Number	13	0	0	13
%	100.0	0	0	100
Total Entering Program				
Number	107	2	2	111
%	98.2	1.8	-	100
All I-TRY				
Participants				
Number	787	38	33	858
%	75.4	4.6	-	100

Table B.6. Reasons for not returning to school

		Reason								
		Behavior diffi- culty	Academic diffi- culty	Dislike school	Need at home	Economic reasons	Employ- ment	Other	Unknown	Total
DAVENPORT Play Corps										
Participants CPI										
Number		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100.0	100
Participants NYC										
Number		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
%		0	0	0	0	0	50.0	0	50.0	100
Terminated Employment										
Number		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CEDAR RAPIDS Youth Employment Services										
Participant										
Number		1	0	2	0	0	2	1	1	7
%		14.3	0	28.6	0	0	28.6	14.3	14.3	100
Terminated Employment										
Number		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Entering Program										
Number		1	0	2	0	0	2	1	1	7
%		14.3	0	28.6	0	0	28.6	14.3	14.3	100

Table B.6. (Continued)

		Reason								
		Behavior diffi- culty	Academic diffi- culty	Dislike school	Need at home	Economic reasons	Employ- ment	Other	Unknown	Total
DES MOINES Operation Youth Opportunity										
Participants										
Number		1	1	0	1	4	1	4	0	15
%		6.7	6.7	0	6.7	26.8	6.7	26.8	20.0	100
Terminated Employment										
Number		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
%		0	0	0	0	0	50	0	50	100
Entering Program										
Number		1	1	0	1	4	2	4	4	17
%		5.9	5.9	0	5.9	23.5	11.8	23.5	23.5	100
WATERLOO Metropolitan Improvement Services										
Participants										
Number		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	100
Terminated Employment										
Number		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Entering Program										
Number		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	100
All I-TRY										
Participants										
Number		2	1	2	1	4	5	5	7	27
%		7.4	3.7	7.4	3.7	14.8	18.5	19.5	25.9	100

Table B.7. Number of people in I-TRY participants' household

	Number					
	2	3	4	5	6	7
DAVENPORT Play Corps						
Participants CPI						
Number	0	0	6	9	0	1
%	0	0	20.0	30.0	0	3.3
Participants NYC						
Number	2	4	2	1	5	0
%	7.7	15.4	7.7	3.8	19.2	0
Terminated Employment						
Number	0	0	0	1	0	1
%	0	0	0	25.0	0	25.0
CEDAR RAPIDS Youth Employment Services						
Participants						
Number	7	24	26	36	27	23
%	3.7	12.6	13.6	18.8	14.1	12.0
Terminated Employment						
Number	2	4	2	4	6	5
%	7.7	15.4	7.7	15.4	23.1	19.2
Total Entering Program						
Number	9	28	28	40	33	28
%	4.1	12.9	12.9	18.4	15.2	12.9
DES MOINES Operation Youth Opportunity						
Participants						
Number	11	34	90	68	70	54
%	2.6	8.1	21.5	16.2	16.7	12.9
Terminated Employment						
Number	0	8	7	7	5	3
%	0	25.0	21.9	21.9	15.6	9.4
Total Entering Program						
Number	11	42	97	75	75	57
%	2.4	9.3	21.5	16.6	16.6	12.6
WATERLOO Metropolitan Improvement Services						
Participants						
Number	2	4	7	7	14	15
%	2.1	4.2	7.3	7.3	14.6	15.6

8	9	10	11	12	No response	Total	Average
1 3.3	6 20.0	3 10.0	3 10.0	1 3.3	0 0	30 100	7.10
1 3.8	2 7.7	4 15.4	2 7.7	3 11.5	0 0	26 100	7.12
0 0	1 25.0	0 0	1 25.0	0 0	0 0	4 100	8.00
15 7.9	19 9.9	7 3.7	7 3.7	0 0	9 -	200 100	5.92
2 7.7	1 3.8	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	26 100	5.38
17 7.8	20 9.2	7 3.2	7 3.2	0 0	9 -	226 100	5.86
31 7.4	30 7.2	12 2.9	10 2.4	9 2.1	13 0	432 100	5.92
1 3.1	1 3.1	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 -	33 100	4.70
32 7.1	31 6.9	12 2.7	10 2.2	9 2.0	14 -	465 100	5.84
17 17.7	10 10.4	6 6.3	7 7.3	7 7.3	2 -	98 100	7.40

Table B.7. (Continued)

	Number					
	2	3	4	5	6	7
Terminated Employment						
Number	0	0	1	2	0	4
%	0	0	7.7	15.4	0	30.8
Total Entering Program						
Number	2	4	8	9	14	19
%	1.8	3.7	7.3	8.3	12.8	17.4
All I-TRY						
Participants						
Number	24	78	141	134	127	105
%	2.8	9.4	19.9	16.1	15.2	12.6

8	9	10	11	12	No response	Total	Average
1 7.7	0 0	3 23.1	0 0	2 15.4	0 -	13 100	8.15
18 16.5	10 9.2	9 8.3	7 6.4	9 8.3	2 -	111 100	7.51
69 8.3	69 8.3	35 4.2	29 3.5	22 2.6	25 -	858 100	6.14

Table B.8. Head of family of I-TRY participant

	Head		No	
	Male	Female	response	Total
DAVENPORT Play Corps				
Participants CPI				
Number	23	7	0	30
%	76.7	23.3	0	100
Participants NYC				
Number	19	7	0	26
%	73.1	26.9	0	100
Terminated Employment				
Number	3	1	0	4
%	75.0	25.0	0	100
CEDAR RAPIDS Youth Employment Services				
Participants				
Number	128	70	2	200
%	64.7	35.3	-	100
Terminated Employment				
Number	20	6	0	26
%	76.9	23.1	0	100
Total Entering Program				
Number	148	76	2	226
%	66.0	34.0	-	100
DES MOINES Operation Youth Opportunity				
Participants				
Number	257	162	13	432
%	61.3	38.7	0	100
Terminated Employment				
Number	20	11	2	33
%	64.5	35.5	-	100
Total Entering Program				
Number	277	173	15	465
%	61.6	38.4	-	100
WATERLOO Metropolitan Improvement Services				
Participants				
Number	54	43	1	98
%	55.7	44.3	-	100

Table B.8. (Continued)

	Head		No response	Total
	Male	Female		
Terminated Employment				
Number	6	7	0	13
%	46.2	53.8	0	100
Total Entering Program				
Number	60	50	1	111
%	54.5	45.5	-	100
All I-TRY				
Participants				
Number	527	313	18	858
%	62.7	37.3	-	100

Table B.9. Education of family head of I-TRY participants

	Year				
	8 & below	9	10	11	12
DAVENPORT Play Corps					
Participants CPI					
Number	5	4	4	0	10
%	18.5	14.8	14.8	0	37.0
Participants NYC					
Number	7	2	2	2	6
%	30.4	8.7	8.7	8.7	26.0
Terminated Employment					
Number	0	1	0	0	2
%	0	25.0	0	0	50.0
CEDAR RAPIDS Youth Employment Services					
Participants					
Number	32	10	22	21	64
%	18.5	5.8	12.7	12.1	37.0
Terminated Employment					
Number	1	4	6	0	13
%	4.0	16.0	24.0	0	52.0
Total Entering Program					
Number	33	14	28	21	77
%	16.7	7.1	14.1	10.6	38.9
DES MOINES Operation Youth Opportunity					
Participants					
Number	45	27	29	44	141
%	12.8	7.7	8.2	12.5	40.1
Terminated Employment					
Number	9	2	3	1	14
%	30.0	6.7	10.0	3.3	46.7
Total Entering Program					
Number	54	29	32	45	155
%	14.1	7.6	8.4	11.8	40.6
WATERLOO Metropolitan Improvement Services					
Participants					
Number	17	3	3	5	46
%	20.0	3.5	3.5	5.9	54.1

13	14	15	16 & above	No response	Total	Average
0 0	1 3.7	1 3.7	2 7.4	3 0	30 100	11.04
1 4.3	2 8.7	0 0	1 4.3	3 0	26 100	10.26
0 0	0 0	0 0	1 25.0	0 0	4 100	12.25
7 4.0	10 5.8	1 0.6	6 3.5	29 0	202 100	11.01
1 4.0	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 0	26 100	10.92
8 4.0	10 5.1	1 0.5	6 3.0	30 0	228 100	11.01
13 3.7	35 9.9	4 1.1	14 4.0	80 0	432 100	11.32
0 0	0 0	0 0	1 3.3	3 -	33 100	9.33
13 3.4	35 9.2	4 1.0	15 3.9	83 -	465 100	11.04
1 1.2	5 5.9	1 1.2	4 4.7	13 0	98 100	11.16

Table B.9. (Continued)

	Year				
	8 & below	9	10	11	12
Terminated Employment					
Number	6	0	2	0	2
%	54.5	0	18.2	0	18.2
Total Entering Program					
Number	23	3	5	5	48
%	24.0	3.1	5.2	5.2	50.0
All I-TRY					
Participants					
Number	122	52	71	73	296
%	16.8	7.2	9.8	10.1	40.8

13	14	15	16 & above	No response	Total	Average
1 9.1	0 0	0 0	0 0	2 0	13 100	9.09
2 2.1	5 5.2	1 1.0	4 4.2	15 0	111 100	11.11
24 3.3	53 7.3	7 1.0	28 2.9	134 -	860 100	

Table B.10. Status of parents

	Father			
	Deceased	Living at home	Not living at home	No response
DAVENPORT Play Corps				
Participants CPI				
Number	2	20	7	1
%	7.0	70.0	23.0	-
Participants NYC				
Number	2	19	5	0
%	7.7	73.1	19.2	0
Terminated Employment				
Number	0	4	0	0
%	0	100.0	0	0
CEDAR RAPIDS Youth Employment Services				
Participants				
Number	18	104	62	16
%	9.8	56.5	33.7	-
Terminated Employment				
Number	3	21	2	0
%	11.5	80.8	7.7	0
Total Entering Program				
Number	21	125	64	16
%	10.0	59.5	30.5	-
DES MOINES Operation Youth Opportunity				
Participants				
Number	53	238	128	13
%	12.7	56.8	30.5	-
Terminated Employment				
Number	5	18	10	0
%	15.2	54.5	30.3	-
Total Entering Program				
Number	58	256	138	13
%	12.8	56.6	30.6	-
WATERLOO Metropolitan Improvement Services				
Participants				
Number	5	57	34	2
%	5.2	59.4	35.4	-

Total	Mother				Total
	Deceased	Living at home	Not living at home	No response	
30	0	30	0	0	30
100	0	100	0	0	100
26	0	25	1	0	26
100	0	96.2	3.8	0	100
4	0	3	1	0	4
100	0	75.0	25.0	0	100
200	2	184	6	8	200
100	1.0	95.8	3.2	-	100
26	0	24	2	0	26
100	0	92.3	7.7	0	100
226	2	208	8	8	226
100	0.9	95.4	3.7	-	100
432	8	399	15	10	432
100	1.9	94.6	3.5	-	100
33	2	29	2	0	33
100	6.1	87.9	6.1	0	100
465	10	428	17	10	465
100	2.2	94.1	3.7	-	100
98	1	96	0	1	98
100	1.0	99.0	0	-	100

Table B.10. (Continued)

	Father			
	Deceased	Living at home	Not living at home	No response
Terminated Employment				
Number	2	6	5	0
%	15.4	46.2	38.5	0
Total Entering Program				
Number	7	63	39	2
%	6.4	57.8	35.8	-
All I-TRY				
Participants				
Number	90	483	253	32
%	10.9	58.5	30.6	-

Mother					
Total	Deceased	Living at home	Not living at home	No response	Total
13	0	13	0	0	13
100	0	100	0	0	100
111	1	109	0	1	111
100	1.0	99.0	0	-	100
858	13	800	26	19	858
100	1.5	95.3	3.1	-	100

Table B.11. Problems with school or law as reported by I-TRY participants

	None	At least one with school	At least one with law	Two or more (either)	Total	Total with problems
DAVENPORT Play Corps						
Participants CPI						
Number	26	2	1	1	30	4
% of total	86.7	6.7	3.3	3.3	100	
% of those with problems	-	50.0	25.0	25.0		100
Participants NYC						
Number	23	2	0	1	26	3
% of total	88.5	7.7	0	3.8	100	
% of those with problems	-	66.7	0	33.3		100
Terminated Employment						
Number	2	1	0	1	4	2
% of total	50.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	100	
% of those with problems	-	50.0	0.0	50.0		100
CEDAR RAPIDS Youth Employment Services						
Participants						
Number	154	20	11	15	200	46
% of total	77.0	10.0	5.5	7.5	100	
% of those with problems	-	43.5	23.9	32.6		100
Terminated Employment						
Number	23	2	0	1	26	3
% of total	88.5	7.7	0.0	3.8	100	
% of those with problems	-	66.7	0.0	33.7		100

Table B.11. (Continued)

	None	At least one with school	At least one with law	Two or more (either)	Total	Total with problems
Total Entering Program						
Number	177	22	11	16	226	49
% of total	78.3	9.7	4.9	7.1	100	
% of those with problems	-	44.9	22.5	32.7		100
DES MOINES Operation Youth Opportunity						
Participants						
Number	362	45	3	22	432	70
% of total	83.8	10.4	0.7	5.1	100	
% of those with problems	-	64.3	4.3	31.4		100
Terminated Employment						
Number	22	10	0	1	33	11
% of total	66.7	30.3	0.0	3.0	100	
% of those with problems	-	90.9		9.1		100
Total Entering Program						
Number	384	55	3	23	465	81
% of total	82.6	11.8	0.6	4.9	100	
% of those with problems	-	67.9	3.7	28.4		100
WATERLOO Metropolitan Improvement Services						
Participants						
Number	79	8	1	10	98	19
% of total	80.6	8.2	1.0	10.2	100	
% of those with problems	-	42.1	5.3	52.6		100

Table B.11. (Continued)

	None	At least one with school	At least one with law	Two or more (either)	Total	Total with problems
Terminated Employment						
Number	10	2	0	1	13	3
% of total	76.9	15.4	0.0	7.7	100	
% of those with problems	-	66.7	0.0	33.3		100
Total Entering Program						
Number	89	10	1	11	111	22
% of total	80.0	9.1	0.9	10.0	100	
% of those with problems	-	45.5	4.5	50.0		100
All I-TRY						
Participants						
Number	699	91	16	52	858	159
% of total	81.5	10.6	1.9	6.1	100	
% of those with problems	-	57.2	10.1	32.7		18.5

Table B.12. Number in household with job*

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	Average
DAVENPORT Play Corps									
Participants CPI									
Number	0	7	10	11	2	-	-	30	2.27
%	0	23.3	33.3	36.7	6.7	-	-	100	
Participants NYC									
Number	5	3	12	3	3	-	-	26	1.85
%	19.2	11.5	46.2	11.5	11.5	-	-	100	
Terminated Employment									
Number	0	2	0	2	-	-	-	4	2.00
%	0	50	0	50	-	-	-	100	
CEDAR RAPIDS Youth Employment Services									
Participants									
Number	17	68	58	44	11	1	1	200	1.86
%	8.5	34.0	29.0	22.0	5.5	0.5	0.5	100	
Terminated Employment									
Number	1	7	9	7	1	1	-	26	2.12
%	3.8	26.9	34.6	26.9	3.8	3.8	-	100	
Total Entering Program									
Number	18	75	67	51	12	2	1	226	1.89
%	8.0	33.2	29.6	22.6	5.3	0.9	0.4	100	
DES MOINES Operation Youth Opportunity									
Participants									
Number	46	126	128	110	18	3	1	432	1.86
%	10.6	29.2	29.6	25.5	4.2	0.7	0.2	100	

* A zero response may also indicate the youth did not respond to the question.

Table B.12. (Continued)

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	Average
Terminated Employment									
Number	6	14	6	4	3	-	-	33	1.52
%	18.2	42.4	18.2	12.1	9.1	-	-	100	
Total Entering Program									
Number	52	140	134	114	21	3	1	465	1.59
%	11.2	30.1	28.8	24.5	4.5	0.6	0.2	100	
WATERLOO Metropolitan Improvement Services									
Participants									
Number	8	25	23	36	4	2	-	98	2.09
%	8.2	25.5	23.5	36.7	4.1	2.0	-	100	
Terminated Employment									
Number	3	2	6	2	-	-	-	13	1.54
%	23.1	15.4	46.2	15.4	-	-	-	100	
Total Entering Program									
Number	11	27	29	38	4	2	1	111	2.03
%	9.9	24.3	26.1	34.2	3.6	1.8	-	100	
All I-TRY									
Participants									
Number	86	252	252	217	42	7	2	858	2.08
%	10.0	29.4	29.4	25.3	4.9	.8	.2	100	

Table B.13. Number looking for a job*

	0	1	2	3	4	Total	Average
DAVENPORT Play Corps							
Participants CPI							
Number	20	5	4	1	-	30	.53
%	66.7	16.7	13.3	3.3	-	100	
Participants NYC							
Number	19	6	0	1	0	26	.35
%	73.1	23.1	-	3.8	-	100	
Terminated Employment							
Number	1	3	-	-	-	4	.75
%	25.0	75.0	-	-	-	100	
CEDAR RAPIDS Youth Employment Services							
Participants							
Number	132	52	12	2	2	200	.45
%	66.0	26.0	6.0	1.0	1.0	100	
Terminated Employment							
Number	11	10	2	3	-	26	.88
%	42.3	38.5	7.7	11.5	-	100	
Total Entering Program							
Number	143	62	14	5	2	226	.50
%	63.3	27.4	6.2	2.2	0.9	100	
DES MOINES Operation Youth Opportunity							
Participants							
Number	304	82	28	16	2	432	.45
%	70.4	19.0	6.5	3.7	0.5	100	

* A zero response may also indicate the youth did not respond to this question.

Table B.13. (Continued)

	0	1	2	3	4	Total	Average
Terminated Employment							
Number	21	7	3	2	0	33	.58
%	63.6	21.2	9.1	6.1	0.0	100	
Total Entering Program							
Number	325	89	31	18	2	465	.46
%	69.9	19.1	6.7	3.9	0.4	100	
WATERLOO Metropolitan Improvement Services							
Participants							
Number	58	31	9	-	-	98	.50
%	59.2	31.6	9.2	-	-	100	
Terminated Employment							
Number	1	9	2	1	-	13	1.23
%	7.7	69.2	15.4	7.7	-	100	
Total Entering Program							
Number	59	40	11	1	-	111	.56
%	53.1	36.0	9.9	0.9	-	100	
All I-TRY							
Participants							
Number	566	202	60	26	4	858	.49
%	65.9	23.5	7.0	3.0	.5	100	

Table B.14. Expected future education of I-TRY participants

	No response	8	9	10	11	12
DAVENPORT Play Corps						
Participants CPI						
Number	1	-	-	-	-	9
%	-	-	-	-	-	37.5
Participants NYC						
Number	1	-	-	-	-	9
%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Terminated Employment						
Number	-	-	-	-	-	-
%	-	-	-	-	-	-
CEDAR RAPIDS Youth Employment Services						
Participants						
Number	13	-	1	2	1	62
%	-	-	0.7	1.4	0.7	44.3
Terminated Employment						
Number	2	-	-	-	-	5
%	-	-	-	-	-	31.3
Total Entering Program						
Number	15	-	1	2	1	67
%	-	-	0.6	1.3	0.6	42.9
DES MOINES Operation Youth Opportunity						
Participants						
Number	55	1	-	-	-	113
%	-	0.3	-	-	-	33.8
Terminated Employment						
Number	8	-	-	-	-	10
%	-	-	-	-	-	47.6
Total Entering Program						
Number	63	1	-	-	-	123
%	-	0.3	-	-	-	34.6
WATERLOO Metropolitan Improvement Services						
Participants						
Number	3	-	1	-	-	44
%	-	-	1.1	-	-	47.8

13	14	15	16	17 & over	Other	Total	Average
-	4	2	9	-	5	30	14.08
-	16.7	8.3	37.5	-	0	100	
3	3	-	7	-	3	26	13.68
-	-	-	-	-	0	100	
-	1	-	2	-	1	4	15.33
-	33.3	-	66.7	-	0	100	
2	12	2	55	3	47	200	13.87
1.4	8.6	1.4	39.3	2.1	0	100	
1	-	-	9	1	8	26	14.69
6.3	-	-	56.3	6.3	0	100	
3	12	2	64	4	55	226	13.96
1.9	7.7	1.3	41.0	2.6	0	100	
12	28	8	148	24	43	432	14.46
3.6	8.4	2.4	44.3	7.2	0	100	
2	2	1	6	-	4	33	13.57
9.5	9.5	4.8	28.6	-	0	100	
14	30	9	154	24	47	465	14.51
3.9	8.5	2.5	43.4	7.2	0	100	
4	13	-	27	3	3	98	13.65
4.3	14.1	-	29.3	3.3	0	100	

Table B.14. (Continued)

	No response	8	9	10	11	12
Terminated Employment						
Number	1	-	-	-	-	7
%	-	-	-	-	-	70.0
Total Entering Program						
Number	4	-	1	-	-	51
%	-	-	1.0	-	-	50.0
All I-TRY						
Participants						
Number	84	1	2	2	1	259
%	-	.1	.3	.3	.1	33.7

13	14	15	16	17 & over	Other	Total	Average
1 10.0	- -	- -	2 20.0	- -	2 0	13 100	12.90
5 4.9	13 12.7	- -	29 28.4	3 3.0	5 0	111 100	13.58
25 3.2	62 8.0	13 1.6	263 33.8	31 4.0	115 14.8	858	

APPENDIX C

NAME _____

MALE _____

FEMALE _____

AGE _____

ADDRESS _____

TELEPHONE _____

SCHOOL _____

BIRTH DATE _____

HEIGHT _____

WEIGHT _____

FATHER WORKS AT _____

MOTHER WORKS AT _____

NUMBER PERSONS LIVING IN HOUSEHOLD _____

TYPE OF WORK WANTED _____

APPLICATION DATE _____

EMPLOYMENT SECURITY COMMISSION

IOWA STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE SERVICE

545 Sixth Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50309

COMMISSIONERS
J. W. JANGSEN, CHAIRMAN
HENRY E. CARTER
CECIL A. REED



HAROLD E. HUGHES, GOVERNOR

Dear Parent or Guardian:

In order for your young adult to be considered for any of the various summer employment programs we are responsible for, we need the following information from you.

1. Applicant's Name _____

First
Middle Initial
Last
2. Home Address _____
3. Telephone Number _____
4. Applicant's Birthdate _____

Month
Day
Year
5. Social Security Number _____
6. Number in your family living at home _____.
7. Estimated gross yearly family income from all sources _____.
8. Is your family receiving any public assistance at present _____. If yes, what _____.
9. I (_____) hereby give my consent for (_____)

Parent or Guardian Signature
Name of Your Child on this record

to work during the summer of 1968. I understand that the kind of work will be in adherence to the child labor laws as these laws pertain to youth working under eighteen years of age. Further, in signing above, I attest to the truth of facts provided to determine his or her eligibility for summer employment programs.

All work assignments in the summer programs will be on a temporary basis for the summer months only.

In order for your child to be considered for any of the special summer employment programs, we must have this form returned and signed by you. If your child is not considered to eligible for the special summer employment programs, he or she will be considered for any other summer jobs provided by local employers.

We are not able to guarantee that your child will obtain a summer job through either the special summer employment programs or other summer opportunities. All applicants will be selected and referred to job possibilities without regard to any person's race, creed, color, or national origin.

This copy to be returned to the IOWA STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE
SUMMER EMPLOYMENT OFFICE - OLD FEDERAL BUILDING - 5th and Court

Name _____ Social Security Number _____
(Last) (First) (Middle)
Address _____ Phone _____
(Number) (Street) (City) (Zip)
Age _____ Birth Date _____ Height _____ Weight _____
(Month) (Day) (Yr.)

Have you ever been arrested? _____

Have you any disabilities _____ Any skills or talents _____

Education: Grammar school _____ yrs. High School _____ Yrs. Other _____

If you have worked before, list the two most recent places of employment, and the name of your immediate supervisor.

EMPLOYER	ADDRESS	WHEN EMPLOYED THERE
Supervisor's name and title _____		

EMPLOYER	ADDRESS	WHEN EMPLOYED THERE
Supervisor's name and title _____		

(over)

Statistical Information

Number in family Family Income

1	\$1,600
2	2,000
3	2,500
4	3,200
5	3,800
6	4,200
7	4,700
8	5,300
9	5,800
10	6,300
11	6,800

† Add \$500 for each

Family on Welfare Yes _____ No _____
 Number in family at home _____ is the family income
 above or below the amount shown at left opposite the
 number in family at home _____

Parent or guardian's name _____

Parent or guardian phone _____

Parent or guardian address _____

Your parent or guardian's signature below will indicate
 your family's agreement to your enrollment in the Youth
 Employment Service:

Signature _____

Chamber of Commerce Offices
404 Main Street

James Lischer, President
Fred DeFayette, Director

Work Application:

Date _____

Name of applicant _____
Last First Middle Sex Age

Address _____
Phone Number _____

Birthdate: _____ Social Security Number _____
Month Day Year

School attending _____ Grade now in _____

If you graduated from high school, give name of school and year graduated:

Name of School granting diploma Year

If you are not now in school or have not graduated, give the name of the school last attended-highest grade completed-and reason for dropping out:

Name of school last attended Grade completed Reason for dropping

Check one:

Prefer part-time work _____
Prefer full-time work _____

Physical condition or limitations: _____

Work skills possessed: _____

Signature of applicant

Return this form to Courthouse - Room 34

Date application accepted _____

Work assignment (place) _____ Phone # _____

Person in charge _____

Additional information:

Dedicated to community improvement by providing jobs,
counseling and training for the youth of Scott County